THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 10, 11 & 12. JANUARY—MARCH, 1944. Vol. XXXIII

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Christian Church and a Third World War.

Mr. Lionel Curtis, in *An Open Letter to Lords, Commons and Press*, utters a grave warning against the danger of a Third World War. Had a less well-informed writer and one possessed of less political judgement and foresight uttered this warning, we should have been tempted to ignore it as a product of war-strain and journalistic imagination. The danger Mr. Lionel Curtis foresees is that British politicians may be led in the post-war period 'to disarm and trust to collective security.' He asks:

> 'What answer can those who preached that doctrine make should history say of them, "Look on the tragic loading of this bed. This was your work." These are terrible words, but I dare not leave them unspoken when what happened before is happening again.'

We are in no position to judge whether the charge is just. We do know that the temptation to adopt a policy of post-war disarmament is almost overwhelming so far as the British Commonwealth is concerned. At the close of the war we shall find ourselves faced with enormous financial liabilities of every description. Many of these liabilities will have been necessitated by the promotion of a vast policy of social reform. The spending of money on armaments must necessitate the spending of less money on social betterment. If our politicians are then compelled to make their choice between armaments and the cutting down of social reforms, who can doubt what their decision will be? Moreover, Christian feeling, like popular feeling, will be on the side of disarmament not only as a venture of Christian faith, but also as a gesture of goodwill towards those to resist whom our armaments are being prepared. We may perhaps assume that the well-intentioned but tragic folly of Peace Pledge propaganda is dead. Nevertheless

we may be sure that the horrors of the two Great Wars we have been through will have created a considerable number of latent pacifists who are unable to accept as true the exacting dictum, *Si vis pacem, para bellum*—if you want peace, prepare for war.

> 'For after all is done and said,
> The heart still over-rules the head;
> And what we will that we believe,
> And others with ourselves deceive.'

The most powerful fallacy in bringing about disarmament is disbelief in the use of force. 'Force,' we say, 'is no remedy.' No idealist can believe that force must be the final arbiter in a society of potentially rational, moral and spiritual beings. Nevertheless we have to distinguish between the existing situation and the distant future, and be careful neither to confuse the two nor to concentrate on the one at the expense of the other. It is difficult to say which is the greater fool—a man who looks only at the present and ignores the future, or a man who looks only at the future and ignores the present. The wise man seems to have given the palm to the latter: 'The eyes of a fool,' said he, 'are in the ends of the earth.'

Force, wisely used, is necessary to maintain peace in our existing world situation; but that peace cannot be permanent unless other factors besides force contribute to its maintenance. This is expressed by Napoleon's dictum, 'You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them.' As other factors of peace—justice, enlightenment, humanitarianism, freedom, culture—increase in volume, so the need for the use of force will decline, possibly even to vanishing point: but that blissful situation cannot arrive quickly. Meanwhile force has to perform the distasteful task of discipline by means of fear. Such a method is repulsive to modern Christian feeling. Nevertheless it has to be used in order to prepare for higher methods: Law precedes Grace. This lesson is being slowly but surely learnt in modern Christian circles.

The Master of Balliol made a valuable contribution towards its acceptance when he stressed the point that Christ did not bless the pacifist but the peace *makers*, and that to make peace in our existing circumstances demanded the use of force, and that the use of force demanded courage and even the highest form of love as self-sacrifice. Another valuable contribution was made by Professor Douglas Johnson in *International Conciliation* (No. 375) when he stressed that:

> 'Mutual agreements to outlaw war as an instrument of international policy will not bring peace, even when combined with agreements to settle differences by peaceable procedures.'

Professor Johnson, in reviewing all the well-meant efforts to maintain peace during the twenty years between the two Great Wars

asks, 'What is the missing element?' He answers:

> 'It is the element of *force*. *Force* to maintain just territorial and economic settlements against the attacks of those who would by violence upset them for their selfish ends. *Force* to sustain the moral judgements of an upward striving civilization against the evil actions of a backward minority. *Force* to implement agreements to outlaw war, restraining the nation that for greed of gain would appeal to battle in defiance of its most sacred pledges. *Force* to compel resort to peaceful methods of settling disputes rather than to the arbitrament of arms. *Force* to assure acceptance of decisions reached through orderly procedures mutually agreed upon. *Force* to prevent armed conquest of a neighbour's lands, and *force* to give all nations security and confidence which is the essential prerequisite to general disarmament.'

One of the latest contributions to the pacific doctrine of the need and duty to exercise force in the securing and maintenance of peace is made by the Dutch theologian, W. A. Visser't Hooft, a leading member of the World Student Christian Fellowship and a Joint Secretary of the World Council of Churches. In his recent book, *The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church* (January, 1944)* he writes:

> 'To those whom the great disorder of our times has led to distrust all forms of political power, the Church must declare that to refuse to use the power of the State for the creation of an international order is to refuse to assume responsibility towards God or man. Power must be used for the organization of peace. To organize peace is to make law reign in international relations. . . . .
>
> International law will only become a working reality when respect for it is enforced upon the nations. We must use the opportunity which will arise to create a world order sustained by force. Only when the international system has given proof of its stability can power be decentralized and shared by all.
>
> Although this last method may be far from a final solution for the agonizing problem of international order, it nevertheless seems to be the only one which in present circumstances can really give substance to international law and ensure that minimum of security without which the world becomes uninhabitable.'

It is not surprising that a citizen of one of the small European States invaded and oppressed by the Nazis should have made this statement. The neutrals who grew rich in the First Great War have learnt the needful lesson in this war that neutrality does not pay. Mr. Churchill predicted that the neutral states would all go down one by one. His prediction erred in one respect. The neutral states have gone down two by two. It is these weak and peace-loving states which have at last realized the need of co-ordinated force and its unflinching use if World Peace is to be secured and maintained. But what is of the greatest importance is that the Christian Churches are learning that this use of force is a Christian duty demanded by Christian love and wisdom.

* *The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church.* By W. A. Visser't Hooft. (S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1944. Price 2*s*. 6*d*. English Translation.)

A Moratorium for Christianity.

The January *Hibbert Journal* contains an eloquent plea for a *moratorium* for Christianity. Hitler's barbarities and Japanese cruelties—their anti-Christian policy and practice—compel their Christian opponents to cease to be Christians in their methods and manners, if we are to secure success in the desperate struggle in which we are engaged. When the Christian States have defeated the anti-Christian States, the *moratorium* can be terminated; once more Christianity can be practised and Christian principles professed.

We recognize the force of the plea that the 'slave-morality' of Christianity is quite incapable of conquering, in this world, Nietzsche's 'super-man' who stands above Good and Evil. If the Christian States are to give literal obedience to the non-resistance precept of Jesus,

> 'Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also' (*Mt.* v, 39),

then we must be prepared for the extirpation of Christian civilization. But the crucial question is whether the practice of the Christian Religion demands from adherents to that religion that they should obey the precepts of Jesus *literally* in all circumstances. Mr. Minto Robertson, who demands the *moratorium* for Christianity, is convinced that such literal obedience to the precepts of Jesus is incumbent on all faithful Christians. He writes:

> 'Everyone who is not a hypocrite, or does not, ostrich-like, hide his head in the sands, ignoring facts, must see that the precepts of Christianity—love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you—are, at the present stage of world progress, hopeless.'

We are ourselves convinced that it is the literalist interpretation of the precepts of Jesus, and the demand that they should be observed in the letter, which is hopeless. There are occasions when these precepts can be rightfully and helpfully observed in the letter; but there are other circumstances in which this is not the case. The only way in which the right kind of obedience to the teaching of Jesus can be secured is by realizing that His teaching embodies moral and spiritual principles and ideals, and that it is the striving to be loyal to these principles and ideals under all circumstances which is the fundamental and essential demand of the Gospel of Jesus. Love of God and love of man are the great demands of the Gospel. But the methods of obedience to these principles in different localities, periods, circumstances, will vary very greatly. He who recognizes this will demand, not a *moratorium* for Christianity, but a needful change in our method of obeying Christian principles demanded by the changed situation

with which we are faced. It is no hypocrisy on our part, nor cowardly refusal to face facts, which makes us assert that love of God and love of man (including Germans and Japanese) demand that we ought to convince our enemies that treachery and cruelty, robbery and tyranny, cannot be practised with impunity, and that it is in the interests of the Germans and the Japanese themselves, as well as in the interests of mankind generally, that these things should not be practised.

As at the present time the Germans and Japanese are unable to be convinced of this except by the use of force, it is therefore an expression of love, an act in their own best interests, to use force for that purpose even though the use of force makes heavy demands of courage, fortitude, self-sacrifice upon those who use force for this good purpose. In using this force, Christians will use it with no more violence and destructive power than is absolutely needful to effect their purpose, and will certainly not descend to the turpitude of treachery and cruelty in their use of force. They will, while they hate the vile methods of the Germans and Japanese, strive not to hate individual Germans and Japanese. We believe that it is very rare for British airmen, sailors and soldiers to feel any personal hostility against these enemies of mankind. Our people are always ready to save their enemies' lives and to relieve their sufferings, in some cases even at the risk of their own safety. We are glad to feel assured that, if a *moratorium* for Christianity were declared to-morrow, it would have no effect at all in lowering the standard of Christian conduct and Christian feeling among our fighting men.

It may seem needless to discuss Mr. Minto Robertson's proposal under these circumstances. We have only ventured to do so in the interests of the Christian Religion. It would have an amazingly disastrous effect upon organized Christianity if organized Christianity were seduced into supporting such a *moratorium*. To present the Christian Religion as incapable of being practised under any circumstances is to do the greatest injury to that religion and to the human race itself. But to insist on the literal interpretation of Christ's precepts, and on literal obedience to them as being of the essence of the Chrsitian Religion, is to injure that religion fatally. If it be supposed that because we British Christians are not obeying Christ's non-resistance precepts literally in our existing circumstances, that therefore it is necessary to declare a *moratorium* of Christianity for the purpose of saving Christian Britain from charges of hypocrisy and of moral cowardice, must it follow that when, after the war, the *moratorium* is ended, we should then be able to render a literal obedience to Christ's precepts? There are such precepts of Christ as 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth'; 'From him that would

borrow of thee turn not thou away'; 'Lend, hoping for nothing again.' How will our financially crippled country, which will require to replenish its exhausted capital, be able to observe these precepts literally? And will our Scotch and Quaker fellow-citizens then demand that as Christian men and women we ought to observe these precepts *literally*?

We note that Mr. Minto Robertson asserts:

> 'After all, Christianity did, and does, postulate a modicum of reasonableness, even in those as yet unconvinced of its soundness as a rule of life.'

We are not aware of any explicit declaration to this effect in Christ's teaching, but we are certain that the Christian Religion, if it is to be rightly practised, demands the full exercise of our Reason (by 'Reason' we understand the combined mental and moral consciousness) if we are to practise our religion to the glory of God and to the welfare of mankind. 'If,' said Dr. Rashdall, 'I were not convinced that the Christian Religion is essentially rational, I could not be a Christian.'* Bishop Butler's famous dictum that 'Reason is the candle of the Lord within us and that by which we must judge even of revelation itself,' stresses the supreme need for the use of Reason both in the understanding and in the practice of our religion, a need which would seem also to be stressed by Jesus if we accept Dr. Charles' view that our Lord Himself inserted 'with all thy mind' into the first and great commandment.

It is the development of a belief in the irrationality of the Christian Religion (to say nothing of the irrationality of the universe), propagated only too successfully in the period after the Great War, which is responsible for some of our suffering to-day. If the Christian Church is not prepared to teach a form of the Christian Religion which is ultimately reasonable, and which therefore can make the most convincing claims upon human intelligence and upon the human moral consciousness, it had better surrender its claim to be the divinely inspired guide of mankind.

Doubtless there are spheres of experience which transcend human Reason, but we are convinced that they cannot contradict it. 'I do not,' said the greatest of the Cambridge Platonists, 'oppose spiritual to rational, for that which is spiritual is most truly rational.' Although Christian *literalists* and Christian *irrationalists* may, in their despair, demand a *moratorium* for Christianity in these dark days, yet the real remedy is to be found in a more spiritual and rational understanding of and obedience to the Religion of Christ.

* His reasons for this conclusion are fully stated in his valuable volume *Conscience and Christ*.

'GOD SITS IN THE CORNER — BUT WAITS.'

The contemporary religious situation in Russia is of profound significance. The Russian people are returning to the Christian Religion—not the whole of the population, but possibly two-thirds of it. What is happening in contemporary Russia happened in France in the period following 1789. The era of the Revolution was preceded by a long period in which the Gallican Papal Church existed in close alliance with the Royal Autocracy—'*L'état c'est moi.*' This situation was undermined by the deadly attacks of the Encyclopaedists—Deists rather than Atheists—and all protagonists for political and ecclesiastical freedom. Then came the Revolution and the casting down of Throne and Altar. Next came the Catholic revival and the new alliance between the Church and State, implemented by Napoleon's *Concordat* with the Pope. This stage corresponds to the present Russian situation. Stalin is Napoleon : the Patriarch Sergei is the Pope. How has this come about? It will be replied that it is due to the essentially religious character of the Russian people. This is not the whole case. The Russian Church has been persuaded by Patriarch Sergei to disown Tsarism and to accept the Bolshevist system. But this only came about because, after the most relentless persecution of the Russian Church and the most energetic and many-sided organization of the anti-God campaign, it became clear to Stalin that the Christian Religion still retained the loyalty of the majority of the Russian people. On the other hand, it had also become clear to the Patriarch Sergei, in contrast to his predecessor Tikhon, that if the Russian Church was to regain its influence it must come to terms with the new Russian State and exchange its attitude of opposition for one of whole-hearted loyalty.

An illuminating article on the Russian religious situation, published in the Chicago weekly magazine, *Time* (Dec. 27, 1943), opens with two memorable citations, the first from Lenin,

> 'All religious ideas are an unspeakable abomination';

the second from Sergei to Stalin,

> 'Let God bless you with success, and with glory your great deeds for the sake of our country.'

It was at Christmas, 1943, that the new alliance between Church and State was consummated with general rejoicings, and the Russian people re-united in patriotism and religion. Russia had once again become 'Holy Russia.' The end is not yet. What is to follow? Is the future religious history of Russia to be that of France, where the reinstated Church by its failure to inspire and purge the national life has sunk into ineffectiveness and dragged

down the State with it? The writer of the article in *Time* asks:

> 'Will Patriarch Sergei's work last? Has the Russian Orthodox Church come back to Russia to stay? Or will another wave of persecution sweep it away? No answer could cover all contingencies. But Patriarch Sergei might have pointed out from his sick bed last week that the first twenty-five years of persecution are likely to be the hardest. He could also point to some definite signs of that relative permanence which is the only kind that (philosophically) Marxism admits:
>
> A fortnight ago the Soviet Government permitted the Church to open a seminary for training priests. Hitherto the training of priests was prevented by the State, so there is an acute priest shortage in Russia.
>
> Russia's President Kalinin exhorted citizens not to laugh at soldiers who wear religious medals.
>
> The Bible is being printed for the first time since the Revolution.
>
> At the same time *Bezbozhnik* and *Antireligioznik* had to suspend publication due to a sudden paper shortage.
>
> The Society of the Militant Godless was disbanded.
>
> Its president, Emelyan Yaroslavsky, died.
>
> But Patriarch Sergei did not need these facts to buttress his policy. It was based upon a simpler and less mutable fact: political policies change, governments come and go, but man's need for religion is eternal. For as long as an ikon hung in the corner of a Russian *izba*, Patriarch Sergei would always be right. That was his Christmas message, a message which, couched in the proverbial idiom of the Russian peasant, was understandable far beyond Russia's borders: even in totalitarian darkness. God sits in the corner—but waits.'

He waits not only for nations, but also for the Church.

Coventry Cathedral and Christian Unity.

The publication of the very interesting plans for the rebuilding of Coventry Cathedral has led to the issue of public statements by the Bishop of Coventry and the Coventry Free Church Federal Council. The plans are the work of Sir Giles Scott, the architect of Liverpool Cathedral; and although Sir Giles is himself a Roman Catholic, his plans for Coventry Cathedral reflect in a remarkable manner the strivings, ideals, and possibly the mental confusion of the Church of England in its endeavour to secure Christian unity.

The Church of England is being confronted to-day with wonderful opportunities for becoming again the Church of the English people; but, alas! there are two parties in that Church—Anglo-Catholic Churchmen and Liberal Churchmen—and their conceptions of how to achieve this ideal are radically opposed. The Anglo-Catholics insist that union must depend upon all accepting the Catholic order of the ministry upon the maintenance of which depends not only the regular but the valid administration of the sacraments. When Free Churchmen accept this Catholic order, then of course they can be and will be cordially admitted to the Holy Communion, and so unity will be achieved. Liberal

Churchmen, on the other hand, while they value their Church of England institutions — including the historic episcopal Ordination and Confirmation — do not regard them as Christian essentials and are therefore against imposing these institutions on Free Churchmen as a needful condition of inter-communion. Liberal Churchmen therefore desire that our bishops should invite all Christians, who are already communicants in their own separatist denominations, to communicate at the altars of the National Church, feeling that such inter-communion would go far towards eliminating sectarian oppositions and rivalries and the weaknesses they produce.

The Bishop of Coventry, a follower of Richard Hooker—who held episcopacy to be, not of the *esse*, but of the *bene esse* of the Church — is on the side of the Liberal Churchmen; but he is restricted from implementing the Liberal policy fully since the English bench of bishops as a whole has not sanctioned it, owing to their fear of an Anglo-Catholic schism were they to do so. Hence the Church of England, in its transition towards national Church unity, feels compelled for the time being to adopt a policy which is a combination of Liberal ideals and Anglo-Catholic methods.

All this is symbolized in the new plan of Coventry Cathedral. In the centre of the Cathedral is placed the altar, which symbolizes the conviction of Liberals and Anglo-Catholics alike that Christian unity is consummated by fellowship of all Christians at the table of the Lord. In the Cathedral precincts is to be erected, as part of the Cathedral buildings, a great Christian Centre of Service to the Community, where members of all Christian denominations can co-operate in manifold social, philanthropic, educational activities on Christian lines for the welfare of the people of Coventry. Uniting the Cathedral with the centre of Christian co-operation, there will be a Chapel of Christian Unity where members of all Christian bodies will meet together for common worship.

Nothing is said at present about these gatherings for Christian worship; but if the present policy of the Episcopal bench be adhered to, we regret to think that neither preaching nor Holy Communion will form part of the common worship in the Chapel of Unity—except on 'special occasions' sanctioned by the Bishop himself. We assume this to be the case because, although the services in this Chapel of Unity will be under the joint control of Free Churchmen and English Churchmen, united services of Holy Communion and the preaching of Free Churchmen in the pulpit of the English Church can at present only take place on occasions specifically sanctioned by the Diocesan Bishop. We hope, however, that the Bishop of Coventry will be able to allow perfect

freedom in both these matters to the Joint Committee which has charge of the services in this new venture of the Chapel of Unity.

The Coventry Cathedral Scheme has the warm support of the people of Coventry, eighty per cent. of whom, we are told, are not adherents of or attendants at the Christian churches in that city. The following statement, issued by the President of the Coventry Free Church Federal Council, testifies to the enthusiasm inspired by the project.

> 'The initiative taken by the Bishop of Coventry and the Provost towards closer co-operation is heartily appreciated by the Free Churches of the city. For years we have experienced here a definite unity in Christ, and we know that the present gracious move is actuated by a pure and fervent desire for the extension of the Kingdom of God. The offer made is most gladly accepted by us. The chapel of unity will help to richer fellowship in Christ, while the community centre for Christian service will do much to widen and deepen the contribution of the Churches to the life of the people. The Coventry Free Church Federal Council, being informed by the Bishop and the Provost of the scheme, joyfully expressed general approval and appointed representatives to co-operate in working out details. We are confident that the publication of this great venture will thrill the hearts not only of Free Churchmen, so that they will confirm the approval of their representatives, but also of the people generally. Together we press on to make our city more nearly a city of God.'

It may be of interest to note that the idea of the central altar in a Church of England place of worship was anticipated in Tudor times in the church of Deerhurst,* where there stood at the beginning of this century (and still stands, we hope) a fine oak Communion table surrounded on four sides by an equally noble set of oak Communion rails with kneeling places for the communicants. It would seem that the officiating priest celebrated standing at the East side of the table facing the people — after the manner of the Pope when he celebrates in St. Peter's and in the great Basilican churches in Rome. We hope that this manner of celebrating will be used at the centre altar in Coventry Cathedral. It would be a return to the usage of the primitive Church both of the East and of the West — a unifying symbol.

English Breezes and India's Coral Strand.

Inspired by the Divine Spirit, Christians in South India have since 1919 been endeavouring to secure practical Church reunion. In India these endeavours, which were judicious, persevering and sympathetic, received enthusiastic support, not only from the several Reformed Churches seeking reunion in South India, but

* The churches at Deerhurst in Gloucestershire, and Liddington in Rutland, still exhibit the Communion table moved from the East Wall and placed in the midst of the chancel where it is surrounded with rails or seats.' (Baldwin Brown, *Anglo-Saxon Art and Architecture*, p. 115, Vol. I, footnote.)

also from the entire Anglican Episcopate of India, Burma and Ceylon. Wishing not to be parties to any 'hole-and-corner' transaction, the Indian Episcopate brought their scheme before the Lambeth Conference of 1930, where they received unanimous support expressed both in the findings of the Conference and in its subsequent Encyclical. The following citations from the official records and the comments on them we owe to an article by Bishop Tubbs, Dean of Chester and formerly Bishop of Tinnevelly (1923-28) and of Rangoon (1928-34), who took part in the initial stages of the South India reunion movement in 1919. The article was published in the *Church of England Newspaper* of January 21, 1944.

> 'This Conference strongly desires that, as soon as the negotiations are successfully completed, the venture should be made and the Union inaugurated, and asks the Churches of our communion to stand by our brethren in India while they make this experiment, with good will.'
>
> The words of the Encyclical were even stronger:
>
> 'We rejoice that one part of the English communion should be found ready to make this venture; we feel that in a sense our brethren in South India are making this experiment on behalf of the whole body of the Anglican Churches; they are our pioneers in this direction for the movement of unity, and the whole communion will surely stand by them with earnest prayer and generous loyalty. . . . For our part we assure our brethren that they will never be disowned or deserted by the Anglican communion.'
>
> Again: 'It was with unanimity and with a profound sense of thankfulness that the Conference adopted the resolutions relating to South India.'
>
> It was at this moment that all the Bishops (not usually given to enthusiasm!) instinctively rose to their feet and sang the *Doxology*.

Immediately after this expression of unanimous support by the three hundred bishops of the Lambeth Conference representing the whole Anglican communion, a movement of criticism and opposition was initiated by the Anglo-Catholic party in England, and an atmosphere of apprehension, suspicion and even gross misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the South India scheme and its adherents was created in Church circles in this country. It is naturally difficult for the Indian, untutored in English Church life, to realize how the Anglo-Catholic party, which insists upon the possession of an Apostolic Episcopate as essential for Catholicism, could yet oppose the united action of the Anglican Episcopate. It has to be realized, however, that the Anglo-Catholic views the Anglican Episcopate as but a small minority of the whole Episcopate of the Catholic Church, and that although the Anglo-Catholic holds Episcopacy to be of the essence (*esse*) of the Catholic Church, he does not therefore feel bound to hold that every act of the Catholic Episcopate is necessarily beneficial (*bene esse*) to the Catholic Church. On a number of occasions a majority of the bishops in Church Councils have actually been wrong in

their decisions. For the Anglo-Catholic there stands, over and above the Catholic Episcopate, the Catholic Faith and the Catholic Order. Therefore Catholic bishops who depart from these must not receive the support of Catholics. This is the strength of the Anglo-Catholic position. The weakness of the Anglo-Catholic position is that it is unsound historically in its doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, and that it is too traditionalist, too legalist, too literalist, too mechanical in its conception of Christian Faith and Christian Order. As a consequence, it undervalues the spiritual character of the Christian Church and the supreme authority of Love, Truth and Freedom as determining factors in the definition and development of Christian Faith and Order.

English Evangelical Churchmen and English Liberal Churchmen believe in the right and duty of the *Ecclesia Gentis Anglorum*, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to act in accordance with the progressive illumination of that Spirit even though other branches or provinces of the Catholic Church may not experience the same obligation to take identical action in their particular spheres. These Evangelical and Liberal Churchmen are convinced that to refuse to respond in this way to the Spirit's guidance must hinder the advance of the whole Church into all Truth (*Jn.* xvi, 13). It is not surprising, therefore, that Indian Christians who do not realize how acute is the difference between Anglo-Catholic Churchmen and Liberal and Evangelical Churchmen should be deeply pained at the results of Anglo-Catholic propaganda in criticism of the South India Scheme.

When a Balliol undergraduate said to Dr. Jowett, 'I have found Jesus,' the Master of Balliol replied, 'I am very glad to hear it; but don't talk about it.' Archbishop Lang, a son of Balliol and true to the spirit of its old Master, foreseeing the danger of obtruding the South India Scheme on the attention of English Churchmen, expressed his sympathy and good wishes to the Indian representatives but hoped the Indian Christians would be satisfied not to call attention in England to what they were seeking to accomplish in India. The Indian Christian authorities felt otherwise, and, as we have seen, they brought their reunion efforts to the notice of the Lambeth Conference. They received magnificent support; and then what Archbishop Lang had foreseen ensued. The result has been that, in 1943, Dr. Westcott — Metropolitan of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon — was compelled to put two questions to the Archbishop of Canterbury as the President of the Lambeth Conference:

> (1) Whether the Province of Canterbury, in the event of the consummation of the Scheme of Church Union in South India, would break off communion with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon? and (2) Whether it would refuse to be in communion with the Church in South India?

The problem was how to reply to these questions in such a way as not to go back on the Lambeth Conference support promised to the South India Scheme in 1930, and at the same time make the reply of such a kind as to retain the loyalty of the Anglo-Catholic party to the English Episcopate and to the Anglican Communion. The drafting of the reply to the Metropolitan of India was the sole responsibility of Dr. Temple, but he naturally and properly desired the support of his Houses of Convocation.

The recent sessions of the Lower and Upper Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury have been strenuously engaged in striving to accomplish this task. We have no space here for details. The debates in the Lower House compared with those in the Upper House are not such as to tempt English Churchmen to wish they were governed by Presbyters instead of by Bishops. We should wish, however, to record our profound gratitude to Dean Matthews for his prophetic utterance expressing his conviction that the Province of Canterbury ought to enter at once into full communion with the United Church of South India. As the upshot of these discussions, the draft reply to Dr. Westcott, submitted to the Canterbury Convocation by the Primate, was generally approved by both Houses, and — subject to further revision to be undertaken by the Primate in consultation with the Bishops of London, Winchester and Oxford — was returned to the Primate for transmission to Dr. Westcott.

This has since been accomplished. Dr. Temple's considered reply after consultation with his three episcopal advisers, reassures Dr. Westcott by asserting that there is no intention whatsoever of breaking off communion with the Churches over which Dr. Westcott presides, but that in the case of the four South Indian dioceses which have implemented the South India Scheme of Reunion, intercommunion will be of a restricted kind. Anglican clergymen and laymen living in these four dioceses will retain their full rights as Anglicans. Anglican clergymen and laymen going from other Anglican Churches to work in these four dioceses will suffer neither censure nor discipline by acting thus. These official decisions are, however, subject to revision depending upon the results of the working out of the South India Scheme.

The archiepiscopal sanction of 'restricted intercommunion' is a triumph of ecclesiastical diplomacy. Disappointed Evangelicals may feel that they asked for bread and have been given a stone. Liberal Churchmen, when they reflect upon the magnitude of the enthusiasms, perturbations and negotiations aroused by the South India Scheme in ecclesiastical circles during the past quarter of a century and compare them with the Primate's meagre concessions, may be disposed to murmur *parturiunt montes, nascitur rediculus mus* — what an absurdly small mouse has been born after the pro-

longed labour of the mountains. But we would urge the leaders of both these schools of Churchmanship to recall that they are members of the Church of the *Via Media* and that the watchword of the ecclesiastical head of that Church is of necessity *Ibis tutissimus in medio*. The question must therefore arise: Has the Primate kept 'the mean between the two extremes' which it has been the historic aim of the Church of England to preserve? Bishop Henson, of all contemporary Anglicans the most competent to answer this question, has decided that the Primate has not done so. His judgment is given in the following letter to the *Times* of January 25:

> 'Sir,—Thoughtful readers of the Archbishop's speech in Convocation, reported in your columns to-day, will note with surprise, regret, and, perhaps, consternation, that his Grace appears to identify the "tradition of the Church of England and of the Anglican Communion" with the Tractarian doctrine of Apostolic Succession. I beg respectfully to protest against this identification, which appears to me inconsistent with the history and formularies of the Church of England, and (when its logical consequences are seriously considered) destructive to any reasonable hope for reunion with non-Episcopal Churches. That doctrine appears to me also entirely inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel and the procedure of the earliest Church.
>
> The claim to divine right as inhering in a specific ecclesiastical polity, whether papal, episcopal, presbyterian, or any other, leaves no place for negotiation. I suspect that, in spite of his generous feeling and genuine desire to advance the cause of unity, his Grace has given the *coup de grâce* to the South Indian scheme, about which so many hopes have gathered, both in India and in England.
>
> I am, Sir, yours very faithfully,
>
> H. Hensley Henson, Bishop.'

Had Dr. Temple responded to the appeal of Dean Matthews and stood for immediate and unrestricted intercommunion with the four Dioceses which had implemented the South India Scheme, he would have been loyal to the *Via Media* and at the same time have *advanced* the cause of Christian reunion.

In ancient speculations on the Atonement, the question was pressed as to whether God or the Devil was the recipient of the price paid by the Saviour for man's redemption. The ancient theologians decided that the recipient was the Devil. In the case of the price paid to save the South India Scheme and the face of the Bishops of the Lambeth Conference, the relevant question arises — whether Christian reunion or Anglo-Catholic exclusiveness is the beneficiary? Church historians of the future will, we fear, decide that the beneficiary has been, not Christian reunion, but Anglo-Catholic exclusiveness.

A rural rector took his churchwarden to attend a fraternal gathering of clergy and ministers for the advancement of local Christian reunion. As the rector and churchwarden cycled back,

the rector said, 'Well, Leonard, what did you think of it?' The churchwarden replied, 'Those gentlemen did seem very enthusiastic.'

We are convinced that the spirit of enthusiasm and good-will expressed in the Primate's letter must, in ways yet to be explored, do more to advance and achieve Christian unity than can be accomplished by the concession of 'restricted intercommunion.'

Prospects of the English Home: Disintegration and Remedy.†

A significant statement on home and family life has recently been issued by the British Council of Churches, with a preface by Archbishop Temple. The statement contains nothing new in the way of facts: its value lies in the calm and comprehensive quality of its survey. The economic and political emancipation of women, the secularization of family life, the breakdown in the discipline and training of children in the home, the aggregation of population in rapidly enlarging urban areas where the life of the home exists very largely in isolation from the life of the community, the exciting artificial and often detrimental character of urban recreation, contribute influences hostile to the creation of good home life. In addition, there are peculiar and painful hostile influences contributed by our war situation, the most devastating of these being the separation of husbands and wives, the breaking up of homes by the evacuation of the children, the removal of young girls in large numbers to new environments, tending to weaken their ideals and lower their morals.

This melancholy catalogue of enemies to the home ought of course to be counterbalanced by a summary of modern factors which promise in post-war times to contribute to better home-life for this country. These factors are undoubtedly to be found in the inspiring contributions which are promised towards social reform of every kind, particularly in the spheres of better housing, more efficient public services, improved national health, and sounder methods of national education. The statement in *Home and Family Life* recognizes wisely that war conditions for our people are not permanent conditions, and it is disposed to hope that we are about to witness a turn of the tide towards those domestic ideals which inspired the most popular of our English melodies. 'Home, sweet home.'

British people are believers in the home life. This has been recently indicated by 95 per cent. of them, when consulted, demanding houses instead of flats for their domiciles. All are agreed that external conditions are an important element in our home-life, and where those conditions are bad everything possible should be

† *Home and Family Life*. Published for the British Council of Churches. 64 pp. (S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1944; 1*s*.)

done to improve them: but the real problems of home-life with which we are faced to-day are not in most cases external. It is in the sphere of personality, its nurture, training, development, that the greatest difficulties and dangers to home-life present themselves. To the Victorian, the entire lack of wise, firm, affectionate home-discipline of children is as amazing as it is depressing. No doubt this laxity is a reaction from a Victorian severity: but for every child that is spoilt by severity, there must be a hundred spoilt by foolish indulgence. 'Woe unto thee, O Land, when thy King is a child,' said the wise man. The home in which the spoilt child is king experiences the worst kind of tyranny.

Good habits are a most precious possession; bad habits are deplorable: but the worst condition of all is to have no habits. That situation is morally hopeless—yet this is the environment in which many modern children are being brought up. Another personal problem is due to an increasing proportion of our girl population claiming sex equality with male adolescents, by which they mean sexual laxity and promiscuity in our social life hitherto only permitted to males and not to females. This leveling down of the standard of chastity among young women, rather than the levelling up of the moral standards of young men, is having deplorable results, one of which is the increase of venereal disease among girls under 16. Another result is the increasing use of contraceptives among our unmarried population, which leads to distaste for married life because of the restraint and self-discipline which domesticity demands. It must not be supposed, however, that those responsible for the report condemn the use of contraceptives in married life, provided their use is directed by a sense of moral responsibility with due consideration for the welfare and happiness of the home.

Any Christian who reads the report cannot fail to recognize the increasing need for Christian homes in this country and the impossibility of securing Christian homes without training from the earliest years in Christian habits and practice. Without such training in such an environment, the animal impulses of human nature prove themselves too strong to be controlled by rational and moral motives at a later stage. Domestic love as between husband and wife, parents and children, brothers and sisters, constitutes one of the most inspiring and enduring of moral forces in moulding and developing our social life and in securing continuity of national developments. Where this domestic love is undeveloped, dissipated, or perverted, social decadence ensues.

The Jews, whose family life is based upon the religious and moral principles laid down in *Deuteronomy*, are a standing witness to the contribution which a strong and noble family life can make to the unity and vitality of national life. The weakness of

Jewish family life arises from the unequal treatment of boys and girls in the family circle, due to oriental exaltation of the male over the female. We fear, however, that the growing secularization of Jewish life will—like the growing secularization of English life—produce deterioration in the quality of the home-life. The only real hope for the sound development of the family life of the nation depends on the quality of the father and mother of the family, and their education ought to have begun in the lifetime of their parents. Hence we cannot expect to-day a rapid improvement following on the long period of decline. Our hope is in sound national education and in right union of Religion, Morals and Science in that educational system. The agreed religious syllabus in our schools which is not going to secure the agreement of the scientist and historian, as well as that of the denominational religious teachers, will achieve no prolonged and increasing influence on the life of the nation.

In dealing with all the practical reforms which are to strengthen our home and family life, the ecclesiastical statement we have been considering does not stress one needed reform of the greatest importance—the providing of an adequate supply of trained domestic servants and children's nurses whose rate of remuneration would permit their employment by mothers of families. It is not to be expected that women of the educated classes engaged in professional and social work can in addition undertake domestic duties entailed by child-bearing and child-rearing together with the work of maintaining a comfortable and well-ordered home. Yet they are the very women who ought to bear and rear children.

This is a more difficult problem to solve successfully than the providing of old age pensions, out-of-work allowances, sickness insurances, etc., etc.; but to-day we look to the State to solve a problem of such immense importance to the welfare of the nation. If the State cannot do it, by training British women or British men for this domestic service, might we not charitably consider the relief of unemployment among the Chinese by permitting them as licensed immigrants to perform after due training the domestic services in our British homes? When these licensed Chinese immigrants were returned in due course to their native land, they would constitute a valuable factor in raising the standard of domestic comfort among their fellow-countrymen. In solving our national problems, even our domestic problems, we are told that we ought to strive to be internationally minded.

There is perhaps a *tertium quid*, and that is that our scientists, *capables de tout*, should provide us with really up-to-date and efficient *robots*. Mr. Bernard Shaw has remarked: 'The worst of domestic servants is that you have to treat them like human beings.' In the case of *robots*, this disadvantage would be remedied.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR: PROPHET AND PHILOSOPHER

By Rev. Ronald Preston, M.A. (Oxon.), B.Sc. (Lond.), Study Secretary, Student Christian Movement.

I.

IN 1915 Reinhold Niebuhr began his ministry, fresh from his Divinity School, among a small congregation in Detroit belonging to a section of the American Lutheran Church. In 1929 he was called to the chair of Applied Christianity (the title has subsequently been altered to Christian Ethics) at Union Theological Seminary, New York. Extracts from his diary during his ministerial life constituted his first book, *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic*. Unfortunately it was never published in this country, for together with Mr. J. C. Hardwick's novel, *A Professional Christian*, it ought to be prescribed reading for every ordinand. In 1934, when as an undergraduate I was introduced to his *Moral Man and Immoral Society* and *Reflections on the End of an Era*, he was still almost unknown in this country. 1936 saw the English edition of his Rauschenbusch Lectures, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, the power and profundity of which soon gained recognition. *Beyond Tragedy*[1] appeared in 1938 and was widely read from the moment it appeared, and in 1939 Niebuhr became the fourth American to deliver the Gifford Lectures. They were given in the spring and autumn of 1939, and at length both volumes have been published in this country under the title *The Nature and Destiny of Man*.[2] Such a quick rise to fame is itself an indication that Niebuhr 'speaks to our condition,' and indeed it is generally held that his thought has been more influential in this country than in the United States. This may be doubted, for his idiom, springing as it does from a more directly Reformation background as it has been moulded by the American situation, rings oddly, at least in Anglican ears. Influential Anglicans are apt to praise him, but to continue their public utterances and policies as if he had never written. Perhaps those who owe most to him are some of a younger generation who grew to maturity in a

[1] This is not a complete bibliography of Niebuhr, but it includes his most important books. He has also written a number of pamphlets, and there is his quarterly magazine, *Christianity and Society* (4/- p.a.), of which I am the English agent.

[2] *The Nature and Destiny of Man;* Vol. I, *Human Nature*, 1941, p. 318; Vol. II, *Human Destiny*, 1943, p. 332. (Nisbet; 15/- each.)

time of trade depression followed by deepening international crisis. Before that it was possible to view the liberal democratic world as continuing its progressive evolution after the temporary setback of the war of 1914-18. It could still be thought that the main job of Christians was to adjust and re-interpret the faith in terms of modern knowledge. But to many of us who are younger that world is dead, there can be no return to it, though we want to preserve what was good in it now that all is in the melting pot. To us the main job of Christians, whilst not neglecting this task, is to grasp the manner in which that modern world went wrong because its disguised underlying assumptions were non-Christian if not anti-Christian, and to demonstrate that the world-view based on Christianity alone makes sense of man's life on earth, and stands independent and unique over against all rival philosophies and ideologies. Consequently it was Niebuhr's radical political and social analysis, springing directly from his Christian faith, that answered our need. The full statement of his theological position in these Gifford Lectures is what we have been waiting for. In America itself there has been no truer friend of this country than Niebuhr, and for that we all owe him a debt of gratitude. In the days of the 'phoney' war and in the dark days after Dunkirk, his unfailing confidence in this country and in the righteousness of what, in our muddled way, we were standing for, was of inestimable spiritual comfort to many of us.

With this brief introduction for those who are not familiar with the background of Niebuhr's life and thought, we must proceed to a survey of the lectures themselves. They cover a vast range in their two volumes, and it is not possible to give more than a bare outline of their central thesis, especially as it seemed necessary to give a fair number of extracts in order to let Niebuhr speak for himself.

II.

If the proper study of mankind is man, man's greatest puzzle is himself. This has come to the fore in the breakdown of western civilization which marks the twentieth century. Behind the physical clash of two world-wars lies a spiritual crash. In the violent opposition of rival philosophies, ideologies and utopias, the key question is that of the Psalmist, What is man? Niebuhr states in his Preface to Vol. I that in this chaos of mutually conflicting answers Christianity has resources for understanding human nature which have been lost in modern culture. He sees that any answer to this question, however scientific it pretends to be, really depends upon certain philosophical assumptions. If any of these are incompatible with, or omit any key element of, the Christian view of man, the result is serious distortion and in the end disaster.

So Niebuhr begins Vol. I with a chapter on 'Man as a problem to himself.'

By analysis of his own experience man can see that on the one hand he is intimately related to Nature and on the other is a free spirit who stands outside Nature. Not only has he a rational capacity for making general concepts, but further than that he can stand outside himself and make himself his own object. How is he to explain himself to himself? Without the revelation of the Christian faith he finds it impossible to do so. One of his most frequent errors is to identify his reason with God and to regard his body as evil. Against this is the Biblical view of man which asserts first, that he is not to be understood in terms of his rational faculties or his relation to nature, but in terms of his relation to God who made him in His own image; and secondly, that he is a sinner, not because he is a creature and finite, or because he lives in an evil body, but because, aware of his ability to survey the whole, he imagines himself to be the whole. Spiritual pride is his downfall.

However, modern culture, which has made such advances in the understanding of nature, has been sadly confused in its doctrine of man. Since it holds God does not exist man cannot be made in His image. In a brilliant analysis Niebuhr shews how the effort to understand man's place in the universe without Christian presuppositions has led to contradictions, and how the attempt to maintain the significance of human individuality without this belief has ended by losing it, both in naturalistic theories and in romantic ones, whether idealistic or rationalistic. Further, loss of conviction of sin has led to a doctrine of progress being held without the Christian belief which alone justifies it and in spite of all evidence to the contrary, so that Christianity has become incredible to the modern man far more because of a complacent belief in man's goodness than through intellectual difficulties.

His conclusion after unravelling the different theories of the relation of man to nature (form) and to freedom (vitality) is:

> 'The fact is that it is not possible to solve the problem of vitality and form or fully to understand the paradox of human creativity and destructiveness, within the limits of the dimension in which modern culture, whether rationalistic or romantic, views this problem. Within those limits modern culture is forced to choose between four equally untenable viewpoints: (*a*) It exalts destructive fury because it is vital, as in fascism; or (*b*) it imagines a harmony of vital forces in history which the facts belie, as in liberalism; or (*c*) it admits the dishonest pretensions of rational discipline and the reality of human destructiveness provisionally, but hopes for a complete change in the human situation through a revolutionary reorganization of society, as in Marxism; or (*d*) it despairs of any basic solution for the problem of vitality and discipline and contents itself with palliatives, as in Freudianism' (p. 56).

As to individuality, the naturalist loses it in the processes of nature, the idealist in the state.

> 'In the pursuit of seeking something larger than a person as his centre, the romanticist meets the absolute idealist who is intent upon finding something a little more domestic and manageable than the Absolute as the source of value. Thus they both discover the nation, approaching it from different sides but agreeing in its deification' (p. 88).

Only in Nietzsche is the individual preserved — to serve nothing but his own ambition. Thus without Christianity the individual is either nothing or everything.

The fourth chapter is an impressive array of evidence as to the 'easy conscience of the modern man' from Locke to Dewey, his reluctance, with the most diverse justifications, to own he is a sinner. In short:

> 'All three errors of modern estimates of man, therefore, point to a single and common source of error: man is not measured in a dimension sufficiently high or deep to do full justice to either his stature or his capacity for both good and evil or to understand the total environment in which such a stature can understand, express and find itself' (p. 133).

This leads Niebuhr to his full statement of the Christian doctrine of man. Again he goes back to ordinary human experience in which he finds (i) a sense of reverence and dependence, (ii) a sense of moral obligation coming 'from outside' and, (iii) less clear, a sense of moral unworthiness and longing for forgiveness. He shows how these elements are both answered and further illuminated by the Christian Faith in God as Creator, Judge and Redeemer. Here is much excellent Biblical exegesis. Niebuhr is no Bibliolatrist, though, and he does not hesitate to criticise Paul's conception of death as due to sin because it tends to obscure it as the supreme illustration of human creatureliness.

The two chapters on 'Man as a Sinner' must be one of the most searching scrutinies of the soul in modern literature. Sin is fundamentally due to man's effort to overcome his insecurity either by asserting his will to power in some form of pride, or to escape from his freedom by losing himself in some form of sensuality, such as sex or drink. Man is anxious, but anxiety itself is not sin, though it is its precondition, for it is also the source of creativity. Perfect trust in God would banish it. Niebuhr illustrates pride in three forms. Pride of power, so mightily dealt with by the Old Testament prophets; pride of knowledge, shewn in man's blindness to the partial elements in his intellectual constructions, so that each great thinker thinks himself the final one, and Marxism, for instance, which can see through all other rationalizations, but cannot see through its own; and pride of virtue, the most subtle and devastating of all, so clearly seen by Paul, yet

so characteristic of many theologians both Catholic and Reformed. Hence

> '. . . religion is not simply, as is generally supposed, an inherently virtuous human quest for God. It is merely a final battle-ground between God and man's self-esteem' (p. 213).

And

> 'There is no final guarantee against the spiritual pride of man. Even the recognition in the sight of God that he is a sinner can be used as a vehicle of that very sin. If that final mystery of the sin of pride is not recognized the meaning of the Christian gospel cannot be understood' (p. 215).

Turning to the pride of corporate bodies, Niebuhr effectively shews how a simple shepherd, Amos, saw through human collective pride more clearly than the Greek wise men, even Plato and Aristotle. He has acute things to say on the conflict of Pope and Emperor, each of whom could see the sin of pretension in the other. Lastly, Niebuhr turns to sensuality (which Christians have more readily condemned than pride) as the effort of the self to escape from itself.

> 'Anxiety tempts the self to sin; the sin increases the insecurity which it was intended to alleviate until some escape from the whole tension of life is sought' (p. 250).

He criticises Augustine for associating evil with sex as such, though he says that

> '. . . once sin is presupposed, that is, once the original harmony of nature is disturbed by man's self-love, the instincts of sex are particularly effective tools for both the assertion of the self and the flight from the self' (p. 251).

The last two chapters of Volume I deal more technically with Original Sin and Original Righteousness. We cannot go into them here except to say one thing about each. We find Niebuhr's attempt to account for the inevitability of sin, and yet man's responsibility for it, unconvincing. He seems to be dogged by an exaggerated fear of Pelagianism. We feel the Archbishop of Canterbury did much better on pp. 36 and 37 of his Penguin Special, *Christianity and Social Order*. On the other hand, we can heartily echo Niebuhr's condemnation of the doctrine of total depravity.

> 'The self must at any rate deceive itself first. Its deception of others is partly an effort to convince itself against itself. The fact that this necessity exists is an important indication of the vestige of truth which abides with the self in all its confusion and which it must placate before it can act. The dishonesty of man is thus an interesting refutation of the doctrine of man's total depravity' (p. 216).

Man's Original Righteousness thus consists in his sense of 'ought,' his awareness of the finitude and freedom which makes him uniquely man.

III.

Such, then, is human nature. What of human destiny? For our understanding of man and his nature leads directly to our view of the meaning of his history, since it is man's ability to transcend the flux of nature that gives rise to history. Yet if man is the curiously mixed creature we have analysed, his history raises immediately the question, 'Is eternity the negative of history, so that it is from *finiteness* that man needs redemption (as many of the Greek Fathers implied), or is history meaningful, so that *sin* rather than finiteness is the problem? If so, how is the transcendent meaning of history disclosed, by immanent progress or by a Messiah?' Niebuhr maintains in the Preface to Vol. II that, just as the Biblical view of man is unique, since it assesses his spiritual stature more highly, but has a lower estimate of his virtue than either classical or modern theories, so there follows from it a unique view of history, more dynamic but less optimistic than others. And just as he has previously shewn how from different points of view modern theories have all let go of human individuality, so he shews that non-Messianic views of history end by reducing it to nature or regarding it merely as a corruption of eternity, so that its meaningfulness is lost.

There follows an illuminating study of the various types of Messianic hope in the Old Testament, culminating in the great prophetic unanswered problem. Since the prophets saw that all nations and peoples are involved in rebellion against God, how could Messianic hopes be in any way fulfilled? They did not doubt that God was strong enough to overcome evil, but was He powerful enough to redeem as well as judge? Jesus is the answer to this question. Niebuhr shews how He re-interpreted prophetic Messianism by His criticisms of the law, of nationalistic particularism, and of 'the righteous.' For this reason Christ was a stumbling block; He was not only 'foolishness' to the Greeks who did not expect a Messiah, but a 'stumbling block' to the Jews who expected a different kind of Christ. By His death as the representative of God, He shewed vicarious suffering to be the final revelation of meaning in history. In Jesus the divine 'wrath' and the divine mercy were reconciled. This can mean two things on the surface:

> 'It may mean that vicarious love is a force in history which gradually gains the triumph over evil and therefore ceases to be tragic. This is the optimistic interpretation which liberal Christianity has given to the Cross of Christ. According to this interpretation the power of love in history, as symbolized by the Cross, begins tragically but ends triumphantly. It overcomes evil. But the idea of the suffering servant in history may also mean that vicarious love remains defeated and tragic in history; but has its triumph in the knowledge that it is ultimately right and true' (p. 47).

The synthesis of Jesus transcends both the optimism of the one and the tragic view of the other, by His separation of the arrival of the Kingdom of God from the coming of the Son of Man in triumph.

> 'In thus conceiving history after Christ as an interim between the disclosure of its true meaning and the fulfilment of that meaning, between the revelation of divine sovereignty and the full establishment of that sovereignty, a continued element of inner contradiction in history is accepted as its perennial characteristic. Sin is overcome in principle but not in fact. Love must continue to be suffering love rather than triumphant love. This distinction becomes a basic category of interpreting history in all profound versions of the Christian faith, and has only recently been eliminated in modern sentimentalized versions of that faith' (p. 51).

Thus to conceive of history is to have a vantage point free from optimism or despair. Man is able to grasp the nature of the Divine self-disclosure because of the residual virtue in him, which provides the 'point of contact' which Barth so strangely denies. Here, as always, there is a dialectical relation between God's revelation and man's wisdom. Life is full of suggestions of meaning which point beyond themselves but which are only fully illuminated in the light of revelation.

The rest of the second volume is really a discussion of how far the vicarious love which is the final revelation of the meaning of history and which overcomes sin in *principle* can succeed in doing so *in fact*, either in the lives of individual Christians or in collective human enterprises. This is the core of Niebuhr's position. His contention is that an analysis of experience will shew love to be a necessity in life but that, if it depends for its sanction upon its success as an historical achievement, it will soon degenerate into a prudent regard for the interests of the self. Nevertheless the revelation of Christ as the 'second Adam,' the normative man, shews that there are no limits to be set in history for the achievement of more and more perfect mutual relation and wider brotherhood, and yet at the same time shews that love is not a simple historical possibility.

> '. . . the Christian faith in its profoundest versions has never believed that the Cross would so change the very nature of historical existence that more and more universal achievement of sacrificial love would finally transmute sacrificial love into successful mutual love, perfectly validated by historical social consequences. The New Testament never guarantees the historical success of the "strategy" of the Cross' (pp. 91-2).

So we come to the doctrine of grace. Grace itself has two meanings, the power of God *over* man, and that power *in* him; both aspects are found in Paul, and again, as Niebuhr contends, both correspond to the facts of experience. He shews this with reference to the three Pauline phrases:

> 'I am crucified with Christ': my self cannot do the good it intends, it must be crucified.

'Nevertheless I live': in Christ my self is not destroyed, but fulfilled.

'Yet not I, but Christ liveth in me': a miracle has happened to me which I could not have done for myself.

But *is* the basic character of human history overcome in the lives of Christians? There is one answer in logic and another in history and experience, and doctrines of grace have difficulty in not suppressing one side or other of the experience.

> 'To understand that the Christ in us is not a possession but a hope, that perfection is not a reality but an intention; that such peace as we know in this life is never purely the peace of achievement but the serenity of being "completely known and all forgiven"; all this does not destroy moral ardour or responsibility. On the contrary, it is the only way of preventing premature completions of life, of arresting the new and more terrible pride which may find its roots in the soil of humility, and of saving the Christian life from the intolerable pretensions of saints who have forgotten that they are sinners' (p. 130).

It is significant to note that to Niebuhr the antithesis is not grace and free-will, which has chiefly troubled theologians, but grace and *pride*.

Having established his main point, Niebuhr then devotes several chapters to a discussion of the way Christian thought has tried to avoid the two aspects of the doctrine of grace by setting one part of the Christian view against the whole and exaggerating it. The Fathers and Mediaeval thinkers are scrutinized, and when we come to the Reformation and Renaissance it is shewn how the first marks the extreme limit of the prophetic question-mark against all human activities, whilst the latter stressed the possibilities of achievement without the necessity of grace, and recognized no hiatus between knowledge of the good and power to do it. What has happened since then? Technical progress, especially in the natural sciences, has led to the complete triumph of Renaissance views, aided by a moral defeatism which marred the Lutheran Reformation, for it never elaborated any relative standards of good and evil and lapsed into quietism. By contrast the Calvinist Reformation went to the other extreme and produced a pretentious and moralistic legalism, based on an obscurantist view of Scripture.

> 'The triumph of the Renaissance was so complete that it destroyed not only particular interpretations of the Christian religion, but submerged the Christian religion itself, as, in any sense, a potent force in modern culture. The Catholic form of the religion became discredited by the fact that all the liberties of modern life and all the achievements of social and political justice were established in defiance of Catholicism's premature identification of its feudal society with the sanctities of the Kingdom of God. The Reformation form of the religion was not so much discredited as simply lost' (p. 189).

Thus we find that the Renaissance and Reformation have each sharpened one side of the two aspects of grace, which had been

imperfectly synthesized in Mediaeval thought.

> 'A new synthesis is therefore called for. It must be a synthesis which incorporates the twofold aspects of grace of Biblical religion, and adds the light which modern history, and the Renaissance and Reformation interpretations of history, have thrown upon the paradox of grace' (p. 214).

In particular the analysis of the relations of things to each other by the different sciences must be allowed full freedom within their valid limits, for in this Renaissance perspectives were truer than either Catholic or Reformation ones. This last point, which Niebuhr only touches upon, is crucial. It means that there can be no return to the Mediaeval intellectual synthesis, no going back on the Renaissance at this point. Rather the whole basis of a new Christian *speculum mentis* must be thought out afresh.

Pursuing the theme of the possibilities of achievement within history, Niebuhr divides historical activity into the quest for truth and the struggle to secure social justice, and gives one chapter to each. The first resolves itself into a discussion of toleration, vital to a Christian who ought to realize how partial is his perspective and how tainted by interest and passion is his knowledge. Again Christians are shewn to have a bad record. On the other hand, the Renaissance, which was more successful, found it difficult to avoid irresponsibility and scepticism. The modern world has tended to be tolerant about religion because it did not consider it important. The discussion of social justice gives in systematic form the teaching on this subject which first made Niebuhr known. It contains an acute discussion of the different forms of power in society — military, priestly, economic, political — and the way in which they become corrupt, and in addition a survey of Christian thought about the State, which stresses the baleful effects of emphasizing only *Romans* xiii, and that out of its historical context.

We must pass all too hastily over these chapters in order to consider the last on 'The End of History,' in some ways the most fascinating of them all. It traces the partial fulfilment of history in the rise and fall of cultures and civilizations (following Toynbee), and shews how 'eternal principles are vindicated in both the life which overcomes death in rising civilizations, and the death which overtakes proud life in dying ones' (p. 318). So it is for each individual. Each one has a direct relation to eternity and at the same time is a Moses who perishes outside the promised land, but who will take part in the 'general resurrection.' Yet history as a whole is a unity.

> 'It must be agreed that history means growth, however much the pattern of growth may be obscured by the rise and fall of civilizations. Though one age may have to reclaim what previous ages had known and forgotten, history obviously moves towards more inclusive ends,

towards more complex human relations, towards the technical enhancement of human powers and the cumulation of knowledge' (p. 326).

But growth does not necessarily mean moral progress.

'Human history is indeed filled with *endless possibilities*; and the Renaissance saw this more clearly than either classicism, Catholicism or the Reformation. But it did not recognize that history is filled with endless possibilities *of good and evil*. It believed that the cumulations of knowledge and the extensions of reason, the progressive conquest of nature and (in its later developments) the technical expression of social cohesion, all of which inhere in the "progress" of history, were guarantees of the gradual conquest of chaos and evil by the forces of reason and order. It did not recognize that every new human potency may be an instrument of chaos as well as of order; and that history, therefore, has no solution of its own problem' (p. 160).

He has previously discussed the fact '. . . that the Kingdom of God as it *has come* in Christ means a disclosure of the meaning of history but not the full realization of that meaning. That is anticipated in the Kingdom which *is to come*, that is, in the culmination of history' (p. 298). So that history as we know it is an 'interim' between the disclosure and fulfilment of its meaning. Purged of literalism, the New Testament symbols of the end are seen to have profound significance. The *Parousia*, for instance, expresses the fact that

'Love may have to live in history as suffering love because the power of sin makes a simple triumph of love impossible. But if this were the ultimate situation it would be necessary either to worship the power of sin as the final power in the world, or to regard it as a kind of second God, not able to triumph, but also strong enough to avoid defeat.

The vindication of Christ and his triumphant return is therefore an expression of faith in the sufficiency of God's sovereignty over the world and history, and in the final supremacy of love over all forces of self-love which defy, for the moment, the inclusive harmony of all things under the will of God' (p. 300).

But 'It is unwise for Christians to claim any knowledge of either the furniture of heaven or the temperature of hell; or to be too certain about any details of the Kingdom of God in which history is consummated' (p. 304). The idea of Resurrection affirms the eternal significance of the historical, as against that of the immortality of the soul, which implies that eternal significance can only be ascribed to that element in the historical synthesis which transcends finite conditions. Let us rather accept the Pauline phrase that the consummation means not to be unclothed, but clothed upon.

'It is not possible to give a fuller or more plausible account of what is implied in the Christian hope of the fulfilment of life; and it is well to remember that the conditions of finiteness make a more explicit definition of the consummation impossible. It is therefore important to maintain a decent measure of restraint in expressing the Christian hope. Faith must admit "that it doth not yet appear what we shall be." But it is equally

important not to confuse such restraint with uncertainty about the validity of the hope that "when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is"' (pp. 308-9).

Niebuhr ends where he began, with an appeal to the experience of life itself.

'All the known facts of history verify the interpretation of human destiny implied in New Testament eschatology.'

Yet men are always trying to obscure one or other aspect of it. Why? Chiefly because they are

'Prompted by the desire to find a way of completing human destiny which would keep man's end under his control and his power.'

For

'. . . wisdom about our destiny is dependent upon a humble recognition of the limits of our knowledge and our power. Our most reliable understanding is the fruit of "grace" in which faith completes our ignorance without pretending to possess its certainties as knowledge; and in which contrition mitigates our pride without destroying our hope' (p. 332).

IV.

This sketch of the core of the lectures has left out not only the more technical details, but also many acute discussions of related subjects — mysticism, Greek theology and Freudianism, to name three at random. In its survey of historical epochs, of tendencies in religious and secular thought and of the whole problem of modern culture, its presuppositions, achievements and mortal plight, one is inescapably reminded of Augustine's interpretation of history after the sack of Rome. It is one more sign that theology has become self-conscious and that Christians feel that their faith penetrates the fog of secular confusion and must play a decisive part in the rebuilding of civilized life. The change that has recently come over Gifford Lectures is an indication of this. The implicit standards by which the twentieth century has so frequently approached natural theology have been challenged. Niebuhr takes it for granted that he can do so and sails straight ahead from the beginning. Nothing is more impressive than the manner in which he shews how the loss of the self has been the consequence of the loss of a sense of sin in the currents of modern thought. We can think of no book more capable of putting Christianity 'on the map' in the secular world than these lectures, and, indeed, have already come across evidence of their power to do so.

Three main lines of criticism are likely to be developed with reference to these Gifford Lectures, apart from relatively subsidiary points. First, that there is no doctrine of Resurrection, no doctrine of the Church, nor of the relation of the 'common life in the body of Christ' (to quote the title of Fr. Thornton's recent

study) to human destiny. This is an important side of Pauline thought to which Professor Niebuhr pays little or no attention. However, it is questionable whether a fuller discussion of the Church would modify his central thesis in any vital particular, but it is nevertheless a subject to which his thoughts should now turn. Allied with this is the question as to what kind of growth in the Christian life Niebuhr envisages for the individual. Probably he would say both a deeper understanding of the love of God, leading to a more thorough love of one's neighbour, and a deeper sense of sin at the same time. But the point is nowhere discussed. Thirdly, Niebuhr gives little guidance as to how a Christian should make relative decisions, beyond stressing that he must make them. He touches on the Renaissance development of technical knowledge, but the extent of the validity of the different intellectual disciplines, their place in Christian Ethics, and the whole question of the obsolescence of traditional moral theology are big issues which require extended treatment. There is a limit to the capacity of one series of Giffords.

To those whose natural sympathies are with the liberal tradition in Anglican thought, it will be a pleasure to realize the extent to which their point of view has justice done to it in Niebuhr's thought. This is true of his firm treatment of Biblical literalism, his discussion of the unfortunate Greek metaphysical concepts which lie behind the language in which Christian doctrine took shape, his recognition of the necessary place of modern technical knowledge, his refusal to follow the exaggerations of Barthian theology, and his shrewd criticism of Barth and even Brunner; his exposure of the frequent ecclesiasticism, arrogance and intolerance of the Church which have done their share to alienate many from the Christian religion, and his judicious references to the Church of England and the way in which he realizes that the liberal strain in it goes back to the Fathers and is no mere modern aberration.

On the other hand, 'liberalism' in theology comes in for its share of criticism. And on the point in question it is clear that Niebuhr is right. He has convincingly shewn, as the Bishop of Truro has recently pointed out, that there *is* a consistent Biblical doctrine of man and from this many liberals, consciously or unconsciously, implicitly or explicitly, strayed. They were overcome by the spirit of the times, by the air of progress and optimism which dominated Western Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and which the war of 1914-18 did not really shake. Other schools of theology have failed at different points, as Niebuhr shews, but this was the characteristic liberal failure and *a fortiori* that of secular liberals. He tears to shreds all ideas of

a progressive harmony realizing itself in history, and the whole strength of his argument lies in the demonstration that the Christian view of man dovetails perfectly into the facts of human nature as they are revealed in the rough-and-tumble of history to empirical analysis. On the other hand, he is not pessimistic and preserves every proper hope of human achievement for which liberals have contended. This criticism of theological liberalism is really saying that its thought was conditioned too much by the secular climate of opinion of its time. Our generation, having learnt afresh from Marx, as his thought has been extended by the sociology of knowledge, is peculiarly conscious of the conditioned and relative factors in human thought. Let us hasten to add that to be conscious of them is not to transcend them, though it is better than ignorance. In fact, this is the perennial justification of liberalism in theology, the treasure which it brings to oecumenical Christianity.

One of the troubles in theology is that old victories are never quite won. The liberal attack on traditionalism was necessary but is largely over; nevertheless a rearguard action has still on occasions to be fought. It has been succeeded by the Barthian onslaught on liberalism. The Barthians have made their valid point and their dross is now being purged. Most theologians are still engaged in this battle. Niebuhr is a stage further on. That is why these lectures will be of central importance for a long time. He is taking the result of these two battles for granted and goes on to propose a new debate and synthesis. What was false in the Renaissance overwhelmed what was true in the Reformation. Cannot, he says, what was true in both come to an understanding and express the two-fold Biblical doctrine of man and grace more adequately than the mediaeval synthesis did?

Is there hope here for an Oecumenical theology which will transcend the Catholic-Protestant division, or must that go on for ever? Into these large questions we cannot enter for the moment. Niebuhr as a son of the Reformation would feel that the essential element in any such synthesis would be the Reformers' question-mark against all human achievements. The unrighteousness of the righteous is central to his thought.

'If, instead of frittering away his time on the newspapers, a clergyman would get hold of this book and read it carefully and systematically, he would find himself not only a better-informed, but a wiser, man at the end of it.' With these words Mr. J. C. Hardwick closed his review of Brunner's *Man in Revolt* in this journal. We can only echo them with reference to Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures.

THE CHURCH IN RUSSIA

THE story of the Russian Church is one of storm and splendour. Three main features must never be forgotten: its intensely national character, its deep mystical and devotional element, and its tolerance, until in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries successive Czars curtailed its ecclesiastical powers and it became in the people's eyes a department of a coercive State rather than their champion. During the war, in every land under pillage and torture, the Christian Church has kept its light burning, as a lamp flickering before a ruined altar. The Russian Church bore her testimony even before the war, when hundreds of her clergy suffered death, imprisonment and exile.

Dunstan was Archbishop of Canterbury when, in 986, Greek missionaries made the long and hazardous journey from Constantinople to Kiev, seeking to convert Vladimir, the Prince. Vladimir listened attentively, and sent an embassy to Constantinople to study this new religion at its fount. The magnificent Byzantine ritual overwhelmed the Russians.

> 'There, in truth,' they told Vladimir, 'God has His dwelling with men. Never can we forget the beauty we have seen! No man having once tasted sweetness can again take that which is bitter. No longer may we remain thralls of heathenism!'

Vladimir sent again to Constantinople, asking the brother-Emperors, Basil and Constantine, for the hand of their sister, Anne; and hearing that he was under instruction, they allowed the marriage. The priests who attended Anne to Russia baptized Vladimir, and married them. Vladimir persuaded his people to follow him into the Christian fold (988-9), which they did wholeheartedly; the idols were flung into the Dnieper, and churches replaced the heathen temples. Let no one forget that Christianity was established in Russia by the will of the people, and without persecution. The Byzantine theology, ceremonial and order are now as fully Russian in character as they are Greek in origin, so completely has Russia assimilated them. The Eastern Church attaches deeper importance to doctrine than to dogma, to worship than to form, to personal religion than to sacerdotalism. There is perhaps enough truth in such generalising to suggest one reason for the chasm between East and West, between Constantinople and Rome, and for the affinity of the Eastern Churches with the Church of England, who in her Reformation sought to recover the purity of Primitive Christianity.

The close bond between Russia and the Mother Church at Constantinople endured for some 450 years; the Patriarch of Constantinople was the head of the Russian Church, the Metropolitan of Kiev being directly under him. Russia's culture grew out of her religion. The clergy opened schools everywhere; Greek sacred literature was translated into Russian, and books and manuscripts were collected or copied. The Metropolitan and the bishops became the judges of the people, their Code being based upon the Apostolic Order, the Œcumenical Councils, and the Byzantine civil law. Christianity thus transformed the whole of Russian thought, life, and order. Justice, education, the laws of property and possession, were all either derived from, or radically altered by, the Church. The prince was held answerable to God, from Whom he received his power, and the Church supported the prince as being divinely appointed; but its special charge was to the sick, the poor, the helpless and the outcast. The abolishment of polygamy and of the abduction and sale of women in marriage raised the entire structure of family and social life. Slavery was a civil institution, but the Church overcame it by educating the people and giving all labourers on Church lands full civic freedom. Church property was so well managed that it became the pattern for every Russian employer. Russian national literature developed from the early translations of Bible and Prayer-book; it was very simple in form and scope, but these primitve histories, these lives of Russian saints and heroes, appealed to the deepest instincts of the people — devotion and patriotism. The strong national artistic talent was stimulated by building and adorning churches worthy of Him in Whose Name they were hallowed. Vladimir's son and successor, Jaroslav (1015-54), built many schools, and gave his own fine library to the Cathedral of the Divine Wisdom in Kiev; in the old chronicler's charming words, he 'sowed the hearts of men of faith with the wisdom of books.'

In 1439, Orthodox and Roman clergy met in Council at Florence. The Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople desired military aid from Europe and the Pope in their struggle against the Turks, and they were ready to make large ecclesiastical concessions to obtain it. The Roman Church was willing to let the Greeks retain their ritual provided they accepted Papal supremacy. The Russian representative, Metropolitan Isidore (a Greek by birth), supported the Roman view; but when he made his report before the Church at home, the ingrained Eastern suspicion of Latin aims and claims was so acute that Russia refused to recognize the Council or to consider union on such terms. Isidore was arrested; and the Russian Church accused the Patriarchate of

Constantinople of having betrayed Orthodoxy. Henceforward Russia would elect her own Metropolitan through a Council of Russian bishops, and Bishop Jonas of Riazin was elected Metropolitan of Moscow. The rise of Moscow to religious and political power dates from this time, when it led all Russia in the emphatic repudiation of Roman claims, and its Metropolitan became the head of the National Church. The Eastern Patriarchates, now fallen woefully under Turkish rule, were regarded by the Russians as inferior to Moscow. Metropolitan Job was the first Patriarch of Moscow, being consecrated by the Patriarch Jeremiah of Antioch in 1589; and in 1590 the Patriarchal Council gave Moscow the fifth place amongst the Eastern Patriarchates; the others, ranked in order, are Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria.

The Church grew in power and prestige. It held its own Councils — 1503, 1504, 1550, and 1666, called the Grand Council because bishops of all the Orthodox Church attended it. The Church, however, as well as the nobles, lost many judicial and other privileges under Czar Alexei Michailovitch (1648-76), who forbade the clergy to acquire more land or to move their tenants from country to town, while allowing urban councils to repossess land which had long passed from their hold into noble or ecclesiastical ownership. In the end it was the serfs who suffered most from these reforms, being deprived of the protection of the Church and the high nobles (both on the whole good landlords), and being tied to the soil, whatever the economic conditions. Alexei's son, Peter the Great, went further. He abolished the Patriarchate of Moscow and established the Holy Synod (1721), with president, councillors, etc., and a lay Chief Procurator chosen by the Czar as his representative. The Synod exercised patriarchal authority in religious affairs, but as its constitution obliged it to act with, or under, the Chief Procurator, it had not the patriarchal freedom. Peter thus finally deprived the Church of its administrative powers and augmented those of the State, while allowing the Church's educational work to lapse.

In the latter days of the Empire, the Synod was composed of eight or ten members, the Metropolitans of Petrograd, Kiev, and Moscow, the Exarch of Georgia, and other selected bishops. The Czar's seat was reserved for him, but he was usually represented by the Chief Procurator, whose power was considerable. The Synod submitted the names of episcopal candidates to the Czar, and afterwards confirmed his choice. The bishops were always chosen from monastic ranks; they were a devoted and generally learned body of men, but there was a great gulf, socially and intellectually, between them and their clergy, who were often

illiterate peasants who recited the service by heart because they could not read. Strenuous efforts were made to educate and train a new generation of clergy, and theological seminaries ('Spiritual Academies') were at work in Petrograd, Moscow, Kiev, and elsewhere; one, at Kazan, put missionary training foremost. The Russian Church has always taken missionary work seriously; in addition to missions amongst her own non-Christian populations, she maintained large missions in the Far East and Alaska. Parish priests are obliged to be married before they are ordained; if they become widowers they must leave their parish and enter a monastery. The printing-presses were busy with original or translated works, commentaries, Church histories, biographies, foreign classics, etc. Missionary and church reviews and over forty religious newspapers were published regularly, and there was a large sale of cheap broadsheets, with pictures describing the Liturgy and everything used in the services, so that the people, though unable to read, could yet follow the service intelligently. This was fifty years ago. In many English parishes even now our people are not so well instructed in their services.

It is easy to understand that the Church which had been introduced into Russia by her princes, and nourished by her nobles, should be identified eventually with a class grown tyrannical and corrupt, and therefore odious. The Russian Revolution, like the French, bracketed the Church with the ruling class and marked down both for destruction, though many earnest Churchmen, both clergy and laymen, holding advanced if differing views, believed that the Revolution would free the Church as well as the nation. An All-Russian Church Council was opened, in Kerenski's presence, by a solemn service (1917), and the Patriarchate of Moscow was revived in the person of its Metropolitan, Tikhon. But Tikhon presently incurred the anger of the Revolutionary Government by excommunicating the 'Bolshevik monsters,' and by refusing to yield up sacred treasures to help in the famine of 1921-22. He was imprisoned, and was released only after signing a complete renunciation of his former views and actions. His successor, Metropolitan Peter, was also imprisoned; Metropolitan (now Patriarch) Sergius, who followed, was known as Keeper of the Patriarchate. From 1918 the Church became the object of an attack which culminated in the 'Godless Movement.'

> 'Communism and religion cannot go together; it is not possible to be a Communist and at the same time believe in devils or gods, in heavenly creatures, in the Virgin Mary, in saints, in pious princes and princesses, bishops and landowners, who have been canonized by the priests.'
>
> —(*Religion in the U.S.S.R.*)

So wrote Yaroslavsky, with all the mental confusion of the professional atheist. The Union of Militant Godless was formed in 1925; worker-members were particularly coveted and received privileges as such. In 1926 the G.U. had 87,000 members; in 1932, 7,000,000, and 1,500,000 Godless Children; churches, mosques and synagogues were closed — 1,900 in 1937 alone.

The dispossessed clergy made all Russia their parish. They tramped the country, baptizing, teaching, preaching. To these humble unknown warriors of the Church, Christendom owes more than it can repay. Monks and nuns, whose Houses had been suppressed, followed the Rule of their Order, living in communal houses like any other Soviet citizens, keeping the faithful together and even attracting converts from Communist ranks. At first the Evangelical and Protestant communities were countenanced in opposition to the Orthodox, but when these began to flourish upon foreign aid, chiefly American, further inflictions were imposed by the State. Clergy were no longer free to travel at will, and religious societies were forbidden to help each other. Yaroslavsky produced a formidable Five Year Plan for the suppression of all religions. To this period belongs the true story of a lecture given by a leader of the G.U., who 'proved' to a crowded audience that Christianity was a myth invented by the clergy and the upper classes in their own interests. At the close he invited questions, and a young priest stood up and asked if he might speak. He was told he could have five minutes. 'What I have to say will not take so long,' he replied; and turning to the audience he raised his arms and gave the Easter Greeting: 'Christ is risen!' As one man the crowd rose up and shouted: 'Alleluia! He is risen indeed!' The lecturer left in silence.

The Godless Movement reached its peak in 1930-32, after which it declined rapidly. For the generation whose anti-religious and anti-imperialist frenzy had inspired it was dying out, and the new generation had not suffered personally under former tyrannies and was non-religious rather than anti-religious. The Revolution had given another direction to Russian patriotism, and to her youth 'Russia' meant all the glory of the past, in every form of national accomplishment, as well as the glory they would win for her in the future. This fine personal love for Russia in the hearts of her youth inspired also the magnificent and deathless achievements of her armies in the war.

Two men observed this re-orientation of the Russian soul — Joseph Stalin and Metropolitan Sergius. Stalin, a Georgian by birth, was educated in Church schools, being destined for the monastery. His object has been the advancement of Russia at any

cost, and he has aroused in Russian hearts an ecstatic adoration which breaks forth in such fervent expressions as

> 'Our Beloved — our infallible, our incomparable Stalin — our sensitive Stalin — our Soul, our Teacher, our Sun.'
>
> —(*Stalin's Russia,* Max Eastman.)

In the Constitution of 1936, Stalin recognized 'freedom of religious worship and of anti-religious propaganda for all citizens.' But real concessions followed: the ringing of church bells was allowed: anti-Christian history books disappeared from the schools: workers were allowed to observe Christmas and Easter: the old seven-day week, with Sunday as a compulsory holiday, was restored. Nevertheless, many of the clergy were put to death. Metropolitan Sergius is as remarkable a character as Stalin, in his very different way. In his view, the Church's only hope of restoration lay in reaching an understanding with the State, whether 'Godless' or not, even as the Early Church had been loyal to pagan emperors in all earthly matters. He proclaimed allegiance to the Government in 1927, which henceforth was prayed for in church: he blessed the cause of the National Armies in the war, and appealed to the Rumanians to join the Russians as their brothers in the faith. The Church's unaffected patriotism could not be ignored by a people's Government. The outlook cleared, relations became more friendly; Russia was the bond; and the way opened for Church and State to take together the momentous step of reviving the Synod, and for the appointment of Metropolitan Sergius as Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. The re-establishment of the Patriarchate is likely to re-focus the loyalty of many Russians abroad upon Russia, through the Church; already in Russia former opponents have returned to the Church, some even taking Orders. The ability of the Synod to serve spiritual causes may depend upon its freedom to concentrate upon Church matters.

Russia and Poland.

Christianity came to Poland, as it came to Russia, through missionaries from Constatinople (*c.* 967). Mieszko I (962-92) was king at that time; but his successor, Boleslaw the Brave (992-1025), joined the Roman Church under the influence of Benedictine and Cistercian missionaries, who brought from France and Italy the rich culture of the Latin West. Poland was a sovereign state before our Norman era, and that sense of sovereign integrity has upheld her through many uneasy centuries.

> 'Our minds are so preoccupied with the Russian partition of Poland' that we forget 'there was once a Polish partition of Russia. . . . Neither the civil nor the ecclesiastical history of Russia can be understood with-

> out bearing in mind that long family quarrel between the two great Sclavonic nations, the ecclesiastical effect of which was hardly less important than that produced by the Wars with the Tartars. . . . Poland was to Russia the chief representative of the Latin Church; Papal supremacy was in the national mind identified with the Polish conquest; and the war between the two nations became identified with a war between the two Churches.'—(Dean Stanley.)

The violent changes of frontiers in these wars made, now the Latin-Poles, now the Orthodox Russians, an oppressed minority; but the Russian Uniat Churches suffered hardly less, and in 1839 rejoined their ancestral Russian Church.

Russian Church Customs.

Russian churches are usually square, with domes: one large dome signifies our Lord; five domes, our Lord and the Gospels; thirteen domes (occasional), our Lord and His Apostles. No statues or images are allowed, the Seventh General Council of the Eastern Church having ruled that sacred pictures and figures must be flat. The Russian cross is unique in having a slanting bar at the foot; the legend says that the bar was nailed there to support the feet, and our Lord, in His agony, pressed it downwards. A high screen (the *Ikonostasis*) at the east end hides the Sanctuary and Altar from sight, and this undoubtedly deepens the sense of mystery and awe in Eastern worshippers. The *Ikonostasis* is rich with gilding and sacred pictures, four being in the same order in every church: on the right, our Lord in glory and St. John the Baptist; on the left, the Blessed Virgin and the patron saint of the church. There are three openings, the central one being named 'The Royal Gates.' The sanctuary is called 'The Altar'; it has three deep recesses, and the Holy Table (The Throne), which is square, stands out in the Centre. Russian services are very long, but weariness in the congregation is avoided by the people being allowed to come in and depart at will. The singing is usually unaccompanied, and the wonderful Russian voices are heard to perfection in church. No one can attend a Russian service without being impressed by the beauty of the singing and the rapt devotion of the worshippers.

The Holy Communion is celebrated only once on any day, and a deacon must always be present with the priest. The bread is brought by the people, in round leavened loaves made specially; the square top is divided by a cross into four squares, each containing two letters which together signify 'Jesus Christ Conquers.' The large square is called The Lamb; it is cut out by the priest with the sacramental knife (the Spear), after which he stabs The Lamb again, saying, 'One of the soldiers pierced His Side,' and (as he mingles wine and water in the Cup) 'Thereout came there

Blood and Water.' The priest breaks The Lamb into four pieces and places these in the centre of the Paten (a round flat plate on a stem), and then with the Spear he cuts out a number of small triangles of bread and arranges them around it; nine pieces in three rows of three denote the Nine Angelic Orders; others may commemorate living persons (in former days the Czar, or Christian rulers). The communicants receive standing at the Royal Gates, which are opened for this purpose; the priest administers the Sacrament in both kinds, using the Chalice only, into which he has dropped the morsels of bread and now imparts them with a spoon. Whatever remains is not consumed, but is kept within the Altar 'ready' for the communion of the sick and the communion of infants after baptism. There is nothing to shew the presence of the Sacred Elements, so that the Romish practice of adoration of the sacramental elements is impossible. Few laymen receive oftener than once a month, and then only after confession and careful preparation lasting at least two days. Most of this period is spent in church and social intercourse is avoided. Before hearing a confession the priest, standing beside the person, both facing east, says :

> 'Christ is invisibly present to receive thy confession. . . . I am only a witness to testify before Him whatsoever thou shalt say unto me. But if thou conceal anything from me, thou shalt have double sin.'

The Western custom of the penitent kneeling before the seated priest is disliked by the Easterns, as exalting the priest into a judge rather than a witness and guide.

Baptism is by triple immersion, and is followed immediately by the anointing with the Chrism; this is performed by the priest, but the oil has been blessed previously by the bishop. The infant then makes its communion, in a drop of wine from the spoon. The second communion is made about five years later, when the child is taken up to the Royal Gates by its mother, and may receive as the representative of its parents, if they so desire. Holy Unction is given to persons who are not mortally ill but desire to increase their spiritual strength in daily life.

The Russian Church and the Church of England.

The Russian churches abroad, during what were for many the years of exile, between 1917 and 1940, were the centres of Russian life. Numbers of Russians settled in England, where prayer (both corporate and individual) 'was made without ceasing of the Church unto God' for Russia, and whose Church was the first to welcome the re-establishment of her Russian sister. Other exiles went to Egypt, where their treatment reflects the highest credit on the

Moslem Government and people. Around Paris there were some thirty-five Russian parishes. In most cases the exiles, destitute themselves, could do nothing for their clergy, who took whatever work they found. Within these parishes there grew up, out of the people's unstinted sacrifice, hostels for homeless Russians, a small dispensary perhaps, or a parish room to be used in all sorts of ways, but above all as a Sunday school where the Bible and the Russian faith were carefully taught, and (because to the believing Russian his Church and his country are one, as soul and body are one) her geography and history.

The recent public pronouncement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Archbishop of York's visit to Russia (1943), are a most significant expression of the desire of the English and Russian Churches to draw nearer in mutual charity and understanding; but the hope and the movement begin far back in our two histories. Professor Zernov in his *Church of the Eastern Christians*, chapter viii, gives an illuminating account of Anglo-Russian approaches towards unity, beginning in the seventeenth century. He describes the sensation caused by the Rev. William Palmer's request to be allowed to communicate in a Russian Church (1841); the unfortunate impression created in Russia by Christian England supporting the Turks against Christian Russia in the Crimean War; the discussions between Father Vassiliev and Dr. Pusey, stultified by the uncompromising attitude of both; Archbishop Tait's letter to Patriarch Gregory VI of Constantinople desiring reciprocity in baptism, Holy Communion and burial. In 1888 Archbishop Benson (whose feeling for the Eastern Churches was one of deep sympathy and ardent hope) wrote to congratulate the Metropolitan of Kiev on the 900th anniversary of the coming of Christianity to Russia, and the Metropolitan replied :

> 'As you likewise express in your epistle your desire to be united to us in the bonds of the Gospel, I beg you to explain and inform me under what conditions you find it possible to unite our Churches.'

Archbishop Benson answered :

> 'No question more important has been asked for centuries. . . . I would therefore shortly outline an answer to your Holiness' enquiry by saying that I should understand that the first step would be the admission of religious believers to Holy Communion in either Church. And that the second step would be the serious consideration . . . of whether any impediments, disciplinary or doctrinal, exist which still render necessary the formal separation in which for strange reasons we find ourselves placed.' — (*Life*, Vol. II, ch. iv.)

No doubt recurrent political tension between Russia and England, through many years, has delayed, or at least complicated, the progress of the two National Churches towards that unity which every

Eastern Church desires as ardently as we do; but there were continuous reciprocal movements between their members which promoted unity by fostering mutual understanding and goodwill. For instance, the Russian Archimandrite of Jerusalem wrote from Moscow to Bishop Blyth (*c.* 1907) to say that had he known in time of the Bishop's holiday at the Russian Hospice at Hebron he would have offered him the use of his chapel for a Celebration. The letter and offer were entirely spontaneous; but a tacit acceptance of Anglican orders and ceremonial was implied, for the use of a Russian altar and sacred vessels would never have been offered where any unsoundness was discerned in faith or practice.

Every section of political opinion in England desires closer harmony with Russia. But a harmony based only upon political and economic co-operation cannot survive post-war fatigue, disappointments and disheartenments, the slow disillusionment of time. We know this because we have watched the process of disintegration, since 1918, of a world gone bankrupt through economic nostrums and lack of vision. The new era challenges our two Churches, both truly national in character and in charter, to prove that they are not exponents of a creed outworn, but alive to point the way through faith and charity to that unity which is the bond of peace.

E. M. E. Blyth.

THE POETRY OF THE BIBLE

By the Rev. Canon F. E. Hutchinson, D.Litt.

THE religious mind of the Hebrew at the height of its inspiration almost always expressed itself in language which we recognize to be poetical. Perhaps it is only long and close familiarity with the Bible that brings home to us individually, and not as something we have been taught by others, the predominantly poetical character of nearly all that we value most in the Old Testament. We have gratefully learnt from scholars with special knowledge the characteristics of Hebrew poetry — its reliance, for its effectiveness, less upon metre and rhyme than upon its parallelism, the balance of phrase against phrase, of word against word; but, though this knowledge has helped us to appreciate the form, we are still more conscious of its having the great essentials and evident tokens of poetry which belong to no one age or people — the rich use of imagery, the refrains, the lofty diction, the sublimity of exalted and impassioned thought. With Mr. Laurence Binyon we may regard it as 'a piece of great good fortune for us' that Hebrew poetry did not commonly depend upon metre or rhyme.

which can seldom be successfully reproduced in an alien speech, while the English translators have given us 'harmonies of speech-rhythm which challenge comparison with the greatest of original poems in metre.' And so we recognize as essential poetry not only the obviously poetical writings like the dirge over Saul and Jonathan, the Psalms, and the Book of Job, but also very considerable parts of the prophetic books and of the Wisdom books.

What is the significance of the fact that so much of the Bible is great poetry, and how should it affect our interpretation of it? How far should the fact that the Scriptures are largely poetry guide us in interpreting even the words of our Lord himself, who nourished His own spiritual life on those same Scriptures and carried their very spirit to yet more austere and purer heights?

As to the significance of the fact that the highest religious thought of the Hebrew mind found poetical expression, it is first of all because poetry (and here I speak not theologically, but in general terms) is the language of inspiration; exalted thought and feeling can find fit expression only in the language, if not always the accepted technical form, of poetry. Our great English poets have had no doubt of it, and have freely made this high claim to inspiration, and have dedicated themselves to their calling as consciously and as seriously as the young Isaiah did. Milton, with Isaiah's call in mind, declares that the gift of song to which he aspires is

> 'not to be obtained by the invocation of Dame Memory and her siren daughters, but by direct prayer to that Eternal Spirit, who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his Seraphim with the hallowed fire of the altar to touch and purify the life of whom he pleases.'

And there is that unforgettable passage in *The Prelude* in which Wordsworth tells of his dedication, when, in his undergraduate days, he was returning in the early morning hours over the Cambrian hills, and the sight of the mountains and the sea, the melody of awakening birds, and 'all the sweetness of a common dawn' brought him to a stand with himself:

> 'My heart was full; I made no vows, but vows
> Were then made for me: bond unknown to me
> Was given, that I should be, else sinning greatly,
> A dedicated spirit.'

For it is not the Hebrew mind only which has resorted to poetry to express its highest intuitions; Andrew Bradley asserted it of the English mind also:

> 'It is in poetry that the English mind expresses most fully its deepest insight and feelings. The English mind sees deepest when it sees poetically. When the English spiritual temperature is highest, it breaks into poetry.'

Poetry has the further advantage over prose of its being better able to communicate the sense of universality. Wordsworth, claiming the authority of Aristotle for saying that 'Poetry is the most philosophic of all writing,' goes on to say: 'Its object is Truth, not individual and local, but general and operative; not standing upon external testimony, but carried alive into the heart by passion; truth which is its own testimony.' 'Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge. . . . It is as immortal as the heart of man.' The poet can speak to succeeding ages with more certainty of response and understanding, because

> 'Deep in the general heart of man
> His power survives.'

It is the poetic worth, as well as the ethical and spiritual fervour, of the Old Testament Scriptures which ensures their continued appeal to the generations of men. The local and the temporary are, no doubt, discernible in them, and in their degree are limiting and hampering, but such defects and limitations are largely discounted and rendered immune by the poetry which outsoars them.

There is yet another reason why poetry was peculiarly serviceable to the Hebrew religious mind. Nothing is more distinctive of Hebrew religion at its best than its profound reverence, its studied reticence. We recall how it was forbidden to pourtray the Divine Being in sculpture or picture; but this reticence extended even to verbal description, when once the Hebrew religion had outgrown its primitive anthropomorphisms. 'Be not rash with thy mouth. . . God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few.' There is an increasing unwillingness to attempt any direct description or definition of 'the High and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose Name is Holy.' Instead, God and His relation with the sons of men are presented in all manner of indirect ways —by the free use of analogy and allegory, and with a wealth of metaphor and simile:

> 'Thy righteousness standeth like the strong mountains;
> thy judgements are like the great deep.
> He shall feed his flock like a shepherd.
> He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass;
> as showers that water the earth.'

The association of the Divine nature with the imagery of light is constant: 'With thee is the fountain of life; and in thy light shall we see light.' And this is reflected in the Johannine saying, so precious to the mystic: 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.' The building up of the Hebrew conception of God comes not from definition but from an inexhaustible series of compari-

sons, hints and illustrations; it is hardly a theology, and still less of a philosophy, and yet it has a richly suggestive content.

I go on to ask, with some temerity (for I recognize the delicacy of the matter), whether something very like this Hebrew poetic tradition is to be found in the language of our Lord. The late Professor Burney convinced himself that the discourses of Jesus had all the formal elements of Hebrew poetry, such as parallelism and rhythm; the detection of rhythm, no doubt, depended largely on the Greek sayings being translated back into Aramaic, and there I can only take the professor on trust. But we can all of us recognize in our Lord's sayings, whether in Greek or in our Authorized Version, the curiously careful balance of phrase against phrase, and the rhythm which results and which makes those sayings so easily memorable:

> 'Ask, and it shall be given you;
> Seek, and ye shall find;
> Knock, and it shall be opened unto you.
> For every one that asketh, receiveth;
> And he that seeketh, findeth;
> And to him that knocketh, it shall be opened.'

> 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow;
> they toil not, neither do they spin;
> And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory
> is not arrayed like one of these.'

We hear this rhythm constantly:

> 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden,
> and I will give you rest.
> This my son was dead, and is alive again;
> he was lost, and is found.
> There is joy in the presence of the angels of God
> over one sinner that repenteth.'

And Jesus, like prophet and psalmist before Him, and like every true poet before Him and since, freely uses metaphor and simile, and is not afraid to use paradox and hyperbole, and now and again a gentle irony. These things should be recognized for what they are, and understood accordingly. If He says, 'The very hairs of your head are numbered,' the words are to be taken as an assertion of the infinite providence of God rather than as a fact, for even Omnipotence would be idly employed in making the count. 'And if thine eye cause thee to offend, pluck it out and cast it from thee,' is a stern counsel of self-discipline, not an advocacy of self-mutilation. The story of the temptation in the wilderness is not the less a record of acute mental and moral struggle because it is told pictorially. And there is likely to be very much more in the sayings of Christ which the literal-minded may misapprehend.

None of our English poets was more sensitive than Shelley to the nature of poetry, and he says, in his little tractate *A Defence of Poetry*, that the sayings of Christ 'are all instinct with the most vivid poetry'; and, in his *Essay on Christianity*, he draws the necessary inference:

> 'If we would profit by the wisdom of a sublime and poetical mind, we must beware of the vulgar error of interpreting literally every expression it employs. Nothing can well be more remote from truth than the literal and strict construction of such expressions as Jesus delivers.'

And, indeed, it cannot be questioned that what is poetically expressed has its own way of being understood, and that way has often been missed. How often it has happened that a mere metaphor or a grapple illustration has been taken *au pied de la lettre*, and has become the basis of a great articulated superstructure. It is, for instance, a strange reflection that the most massive of all ecclesiastical structures has for its foundation-stone a play upon words: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this *petra* I will build my church.' Or again, there are elaborate theories built upon a single word in a saying attributed to our Lord that 'the Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many'; a metaphor becomes a definition, the metaphor is no longer an illustration but an article of faith, and its possible implications are worked out with a legal thoroughness. Since a ransom-price must be paid to someone, the notion found very general, though not universal, acceptance for many hundred years from Irenaeus to Anselm, that it was paid to the devil. But if we turn from this hard prosaic legalism back to the 53rd chapter of *Isaiah*, from which that word 'many' was, no doubt, derived, we are conscious of breathing in another atmosphere. There the idea of the innocent willingly suffering for the advantage of others is so convincingly presented that we see its universal truth and its sovereign importance. We recognize it as a truth that runs through all human life, verified afresh in every generation and illustrated abundantly in the most profound and tragic literature of all ages. And because it is thus universal, inescapable, revealing, and morally satisfying, we are the more ready to find the culminating example and the supreme significance of this truth in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ; we are awed by it, convinced of it, responsive to it. I speak for many, though not for all, when I say that it is the poetry of the unknown prophet and of Him who was greater than the prophets which brings us to humble and grateful acceptance of this truth, rather than the definitions of expiation and satisfaction which have been constructed to safeguard it. It is not that such attempts to explain should not be made, it is not that the human mind should not

exercise itself to the uttermost in seeking to find an explication that is both true to experience and ethically allowable; but the poetry of the Bible and of Jesus himself is a necessary balance or corrective of all such theorising. The best divines have, indeed, always confessed their reluctance to define, and they have echoed those pathetic words of St. Hilary, which I first heard as an undergraduate in Charles Gore's Bampton Lectures:

> 'We are obliged to attempt what is unattainable, to scale heights inaccessible, to speak what we cannot utter, to presume where we ought not. And whereas it is by faith that we should worship the Father, and reverence the Son, and be filled with the Spirit, we are now obliged to strain our weak human language in the utterance of things beyond our scope. . . . Hence, what should be matter of silent religious meditation must now needs be imperilled by exposition in words.'

Seeing, then, that human language is at best inadequate for the highest themes, and that there are unfathomed depths beyond the little that is known, we must needs apologize for our hardihood in speaking at all of celestial things; but — *ne taceatur* — in order that we shall not err on the other side by default, we must call to our aid not the theologian only but the poet; for the poet can go further in communicating the ineffable things, partly because he suggests more than even he can directly express. This is the virtue, not the defect, of poetry, as the instrument of deep feeling and high thinking, that, as Edmond Holmes remarked, 'it says many things to many men, and so leaves each man free to interpret its message for himself.' The highest truths, the truths that survive every challenge and the successive changes of human thought, come home to us in the universal language of inspired poetry. And, to our endless profit, that inspired poetry finds its finest and most enduring examples in the sacred scriptures, and they 'find us at greater depths of our being' than all else that has ever been written.

'OUR COUNTRYMAN, THE EXCELLENT MR. RAY'[1]

By the Rev. Norman Power, M.A., Worcester College, Oxford.

'God is as truly the God of Nature as the God of Grace: of that which bravely questioneth as of that which humbly kneels.'—F. Von Hügel.

JOHN RAY, by Professor Raven, is a book[2] which can, for once without exaggeration, be described as monumental. It must surely hasten the time when it will dawn even upon Dr. Joad that there are authoritative statements of the relationship between science and religion published since the days of Dr. Gore, a circumstance that he seems to have overlooked even with his eyes upon Birmingham. It is a book in which the reader feels the impact of two great minds, for although the biographer has given all the limelight to his subject, his own grasp of Ray's studies, in their origins and more recent developments, proclaims upon how wide a range of knowledge his own philosophy is based.

The divorce of truth that is revealed by God from truths that are discovered by men paralysed mediaeval science. That same divorce is partly responsible for the escapist and panic theologies which are raising to-day their transient heads. As Streeter's *Reality* so clearly and convincingly illustrates, there are two ways of knowledge. But so far from being independent, they are interactive, like the two 'unknowns' in a simultaneous equation. Since no truths can be incompatible, to neglect one way of truth for another is as foolish as it is dangerous, and accounts for the unsatisfying nature of much that passes for Theology.

'It is not too much to say,' wrote F. J. A. Hort, 'that the Gospel itself can never be fully known till nature as well as man is fully known.'

Bacon foreshadowed the true approach when he valued equally 'the Book of God's Word' and 'the book of God's works.' But as it was Bacon whose influence and scholarship sent Western Europe to its study of the book of God's works, it was Ray who stated with the finest clarity the position of which Bacon was so notable a pioneer:

'There are those who condemn the study of Experimental Philosophy as a mere inquisitiveness and denounce the passion for knowledge as a pursuit unpleasing to God. . . . As if Almighty God were jealous of the knowledge of men. As if, when He first formed us, He did not clearly

[1] Gilbert White to Daines Barrington. Letter X, 1 Aug. 1771.

[2] *John Ray*, by C. E. Raven. (Cambridge University Press, 502 pp.; 30s. 1943.)

perceive how far the light of human intelligence could penetrate, or, were it to His glory to do so, could not have confined it within narrower limits.'

'From the third to the sixteenth century,' says Dr. Raven, 'the note that Ray strikes had been almost entirely mute.'

So important is this aspect of the study of Ray that the reader is tempted to read back into his work much that has resulted from it. Dr. Raven anticipates the tendency:

> 'We shall mistake the quality of his (Ray's) achievement if we misunderstand him here. He was not an anticipator of Darwin, even though he admits doubt of the fixity of species and records evidence of their transformation. He is not possessed of a clear and consistent philosophy foreshadowing the modern outlook. . . .'

He is not a philosophic theologian, though his *Wisdom of God* supplied the basis for Butler's *Analogy* and is a greater book than Paley's *Natural Theology*. His greatness is that in a time of transition and universal turmoil he saw the need for precise and ordered knowledge.

Whatever, in fact, Ray might have written, his mind was too orderly not to begin at the beginning. Whatever his studies have led to, his own claim to fame is in his catalogues, which made order out of chaos. The nature of that chaos Dr. Raven's extraordinary knowledge of contemporary scientific literature well enables him to describe. And this knowledge is by no means derived from Ray. The *History of Fishes*, for example, was a particularly heavy task, since more work had been done on this subject than on the others which Ray tackled. And with this work Dr. Raven shows himself remarkably familiar (pp. 341 *ff.*).

Dr. Raven's appreciation of Ray would be less valuable if it were less critical, and few men are in a position so to criticize:

> 'That the Eagles and the birds of prey should head the list, and that therefore the large and predatory crow tribe should be taken out of alliance with the Passerines are natural errors,' says Dr. Raven of the *Ornithology*; 'that the two Reed Warblers (*Acrocephalus arundinaceus* and *A. scirpaceus*) should be grouped near the Woodpeckers is less excusable.'

He adds:

> 'No one will claim that he has produced a fully satisfactory classification: no one, who realises how small were his data and how great the chaos of tradition, will refuse a real admiration for his achievement.'

Dr. Raven is writing as field naturalist as well as theorist. 'I have collected,' says Dr. Raven, 'nearly all the plants, birds and insects that Ray records, and often in the same localities.' Ray's *History of Plants* alone consisted of 3,000 folio pages. It is a colossal claim that Dr. Raven makes so modestly. It is no surprise, there-

fore, that he is so confident in accusing Edwin Lankester's edition of Ray's letters of 'monumental inaccuracies' and in denouncing Professor Boulger's[3] use of 'a gossiping paragraph in a gardening paper' concerning a benefaction to Ray by a Black Notley squire, which, he says, 'a few minutes' research would have exploded.' This error, incidentally, is preserved in the *D.N.B.*

Dr. Raven begins by describing Ray's background and upbringing. He was born at Black Notley smithy in 1627. His father, Roger, was a craftsman, but blacksmiths, however skilful, are rarely lovers of books. His brother and sister died in infancy of smallpox, which explains, says Dr. Raven, his devotion to his family, his genius for friendship and his dread of loneliness. 'The few occasions on which he reveals his feelings are all associated with the threat of solitude.' The remoteness of Ray's native hamlet may also explain his aloofness from the political upheavals of his time and his easy retirement to the life of a student and recluse in his own village.

Ray's mother was evidently a good and pious woman, and 'from her he got his religion, the motive evident and avowed in all his work.' To her, perhaps, Ray owed the unworldliness of his character,

> 'the faith that could see life steadily and see it whole . . . the conviction that could surrender success and security for conscience sake.'

His character could hardly be better or more briefly described than in John Worthington's noble words:

> 'He is a person of great worth; and yet humble, and far from conceitedness and self-admiring, . . . a conscientious Christian; and that's much said in little.'

His passion for ordered knowledge, however, far transcended his mother's interest in therapeutic herbs. He was before his time in his distaste for the legendary and irrational and in not only rejecting but ridiculing witchcraft.

Thomas Goad and Joseph Plume, both Rectors of Black Notley during Ray's childhood, must take some credit for his early schooling. Their influence may have sent him to the Braintree Grammar School and encouraged him to study. This school at least provided its pupil with a sound background of Latin, of which Ray became a great master. At Braintree, too, the Vicar, Samuel Collins, a Cambridge graduate, may have influenced Ray. Collins' experience of Laud, incidentally, is interesting in view of recent attempts to whitewash that unlovely character (p. 16).

Ray went to Cambridge in 1644, when he was aged 16. He was transferred from Trinity to Catherine Hall in his first year,

[3] *Science, Religion and the Future,* by Raven, p. 87.

for with the authorities of Catherine Hall, Collins of Braintree had some influence through his administration of a bursary. Ray's Cambridge career throws a great deal of light on the limitations of a seventeenth century university. Ray was not at home in an institution so concerned with 'conventional discourses upon hackneyed themes.' But at least he perfected his Latin style, and it was his mastery of Latin which gave Ray an international reputation if it limited his British sales. It was the German, Haller, who described Ray as 'the greatest botanist in the memory of man.' Ray returned to Trinity before taking his degree.

Ray also won academic distinction in Greek and Hebrew, studied mathematics with Barrow, who was outstanding at that time, and was influenced by the Platonism of Whichcote and Henry More, whose *Antidote against Atheism* suggested the theme of his *Wisdom of God*. The refusal of the Cambridge Platonists to 'set nature and grace in antithesis' was an admirable example for the future botanist. Had he not shared it, he might still have produced his Catalogues and Histories, but he could not have written *The Wisdom of God*.

Between 1651 and 1655 Ray was lecturing in Greek, Mathematics and Humanities in a Cambridge which was leading a new quest for truth and a new interest in science. His friend Nidd, for example, kept a vivarium in his rooms. Walter Needham of Queens' was studying medicine and anatomy, and Robert Boyle was soon to make the whole of educated England conscious of the possibilities of chemistry. During these years Ray began his study of science. By 1654 tradition was looking askance at the botanist, now a college tutor, and the freshmen who were searching the countryside for plants. Among these was Francis Willughby.

In 1660 Ray was ordained, not foreseeing the temper of the Cavalier Parliament. That this step was not taken merely to qualify for a Fellowship is proved by his later refusal of the secretaryship of the Royal Society on the grounds that 'Divinity is my profession.' In 1662 Ray refused the oath demanded by the Act of Uniformity, and so for conscience sake he forfeited his fellowship and hopes of preferment and returned from a tour of Cornwall to the seclusion of Black Notley.

Ray's first publication was that of the Cambridge Catalogue in 1660. William Turner, who died in 1568 and who published a Herbal for medical use, said of the ignorance of Botany at Cambridge in his time :

> 'I could never learn one Greek, neither Latin nor English name, even amongst the physicians, of any herb or tree, and as yet there was no English Herbal, but one full of unlearned cacographies and falsely naming of herbs.'

Dr. Raven shows in detail the inadequacy of previous botanical research. Here, as throughout the book, he shows an encyclopaedic knowledge of English and Continental writings relevant to Ray's researches. This knowledge is a feature of the book to which a short article can do nothing like justice.

Ray stated that the purpose of his Catalogue was not only the enhancement of the reputation of Cambridge, but 'to illustrate the glory of God in the knowledge of the works of nature.' If his fame is in his catalogues, he is always far more than a mere collector. He always interprets what he systematizes. It was his later work, however, that was to show him as a great taxonomist as well as a collector. But the Cambridge Catalogue was a worthy beginning to his achievement of leaving order where he found ignorance and superstition.

Dr. Raven next describes the travels of Ray, travels on which he observed and classified tirelessly not only plants, but fishes, insects, animals, birds and fossils. His observations are stated in great detail. Ray's travels were extensive and occupied most of three years. Besides covering the British Isles, Ray visited France, the Low Countries, Germany, Austria, Italy (where he studied anatomy at Padua in the winter of 1664), Malta and Switzerland. An extraordinary achievement for a man who was never very robust. He was seriously ill in 1667, the year of his election to the Royal Society, which now once more honours him by financing the publication of this biography. The book illustrates the 'vital and varied activities' of the Society at this time.

With the immense data his travels had given him, Ray now began his English catalogue, which was published in 1670. The book is the foundation of scientific botany and shows that Ray was not only tireless in travel, observation and research, but that he had a flair for scientific description. He appended a note on the medical use of herbs. He was a pioneer of botanical anatomy (p. 188) and his distinction between mono- and di-cotyledonous plants is an example of his success. His methods are fully described (p, 190).

Ray married in 1673 and moved to Dewlands at Black Notley in 1679. The house must have been a wonder and a delight to casual visitors, containing not only Ray, his wife and family, but '300 lepidoptera,' his enormous collection of specimens, and curiosities sent by friends from all over the world — for example, the first sample of maple sugar from Canada.

The *History of Plants* was published between 1686 and 1704 in three separate volumes. Dr. Raven illustrates with a wealth of detail the magnitude and importance of this extraordinary work.

His last work on the flora of Britain was his *Synopsis* (1690), of which Sir James Smith has written:

> 'Of all the systematical and practical floras of any country, the second edition of Ray's *Synopsis* is the most perfect that ever came under our observation.'

Dr. Raven concludes of it, 'British Botany had been given a secure and intelligible foundation.'

The *Ornithology* was published in 1676, and it is, Dr. Raven shows, a mistake to give Willughby the credit for this work. Ray and Willughby had collected the material and the task of arranging it fell to Ray. No more can be said of it here but that ample evidence is produced to show that Ray once more left order where he found confusion and obscurity. Alfred Newton says in his *Dictionary of Birds* that 'the foundation of scientific Ornithology was laid by the joint efforts of Francis Willughby and John Ray.'

Dr. Raven describes with the same amazing detail Ray's work on *The History of Fishes* (1685), *The History of Insects* (1710) and the *Synopsis of Quadrupeds* (1693).

Ray's excursion into Geology — his *Discourses* — was perhaps less happy. He had neither time nor health to equal his best work. But he shows an enormous book knowledge of the subject, and in 1695 he had the courage to base on his observation of fossil plants a conclusion which broke with tradition, the conclusion that species have come into being and died out since life on earth began. However, his travel diary shows that in this field, too, Ray was a notable pioneer. His view of the nature of fossils was correct, and he stated clearly the difficulties their existence involved at a time when the Flood was regarded as the only great inundation in history. He realized that Noah's 'Flood' would have an opposite effect on the distribution of fossils to that which he observed.

Dr. Raven devotes a chapter to each of Ray's major studies, and concludes with an account of Ray's *Wisdom of God* (1691). This book inspired Gilbert White, whose love of and interest in nature has had incalculable influence. Paley makes extensive use of it, and it is the ancestor of *The Origin of Species*. It shows how much greater than Linnaeus Ray was, for the Swede regarded classification as the sole duty of the naturalist.

> 'A good case could be made,' says Dr. Raven, 'for assigning to the . . *Wisdom of God* a primary place in the development of modern science.'

In spite of its detail, the narrative of Dr. Raven's monumental work on Ray is of sustained interest, and the style is as clear as the thought. It is not only a fitting tribute to a neglected genius, but it is far more. It is a landmark in the noble *terrain* of English scholarship.

IS OUR KING A LAYMAN?

By the Rev. John Todd, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Waterstock, Oxford.

WHAT is the significance of the English coronation service? We speak, indeed, of the 'coronation,' but in truth this name for the ceremony is misleading, for the original name is not 'Coronation of the King,' but 'Sacring of the King,' *Benedictio* or *Consecratio Regis*, and the culminating act of the service is not the crowning but the anointing The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that Egferth of Mercia was 'hallowed to king' in 785 A.D. '*to cyninge gehalgod*,' and ten years later Eardwulf of Northumbria was 'blessed to king.' Indeed, in the two recensions of the earliest English coronation service, which may be dated between 960 A.D. and 973 A.D., there is no mention of a crown. In the earlier recension, the bishops anoint the king and enthrone him, and in the later recension, the bishops, after anointing the king, place a staff in his hand and a helmet (a *galeus*, not a *corona*) upon his head, and it is not until the sacring of King Edgar in 973 A.D. that a crown is given together with other insignia after the anointing. Thus, whilst there is no example of an English coronation service without anointing, there are examples of English coronation services without a crown.

Furthermore, the familiar words, 'The King is dead. Long live the King,' implying that the king succeeds immediately upon the death of his predecessor, have tended to obscure the significance of the anointing, for it is not always realized that for centuries these words would have been utterly inapplicable in England. To-day we are accustomed to the practice whereby one king succeeds immediately on the death of his predecessor, but every king before Edward I dated his accession, not from his predecessor's death but from his own anointing. Henry III died on November 16th, 1272. His son Edward happened to be abroad at the time in Palestine with no immediate prospect of returning. Something had to be done to secure the succession, so he was proclaimed king on the Sunday following his father's death, but not anointed and crowned until his return two years later. He was thus the first English king to date his accession from his predecessor's death. Even to-day a trace of the older custom survives, for the peers of the realm pay their homage to the new king not when he succeeds to the throne, but after he has been anointed and crowned.[1] Since the accession of George III the coronation

[1] The Pope still reckons his pontificate not from the day of his election but from the day of his coronation.

has not taken place until a year of mourning for the dead king has expired, and this postponement of the ceremony has robbed the service of much of its significance and helped to turn what was originally a holy sacrament into little more than a grand pageant.

The method by which the later Roman Emperors entered upon their office was a combination of Roman rites and the Teutonic *gyratio*, the custom whereby the new emperor was raised on a shield by the soldiers and carried round in procession. But when the empire became Christian this secular ceremony of inauguration was gradually transformed into a religious ceremony, just as, for example, the marriage ceremony was so transformed. Two forces were at work which tended to give the emperor (and later the kings in the West who arose after the fall of the Western Empire) a sacred status. First, with the conversion of Constantine, the emperor became the patron and protector of the Church and thus his actions were invested with a sacred authority. It was Constantine and not a bishop who presided over the Council of Nicaea, and to this day the Greek Church honours Constantine with the title Ἰσαπόστολος, *Equal to the Apostles*.

The ruler was regarded by the Church as the representative of God, 'Vicarius Dei,' and Ambrosiaster, writing towards the end of the fourth century, leaves no doubt about the relative position of king and bishop. 'The king has the image of God,' writes Ambrosiaster, 'and the bishop that of Christ.' S. Augustine argued that the authority of the ruler is derived from God Himself, even in the case of the worst rulers. But Gregory the Great goes beyond this, and in his book on Pastoral Care, a book which was translated into English by King Alfred and which had a wide circulation in the Middle Ages, Gregory warns all subjects against criticizing the conduct of their rulers, even when they do wrong. Here we have the germ, and more than the germ, of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, and, indeed, it would be difficult for any seventeenth century apologist for that right to go farther than Pope Gregory in the sixth century.

But the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings would hardly have been strong enough to lift kings out of the ranks of laymen had it not been reinforced by Old Testament precedent and rooted in the Old Testament tradition of kingship. It is this Old Testament tradition of kingship which is the second force which tended to invest the king with sacred authority. In the Old Testament the king is *Christus Domini*, the Lord's anointed. Saul was anointed by Samuel, as was also David. Solomon was anointed by Zadok, Joash by Jehoiada, and it was the anointing which made

the person of the king sacred. 'Touch not mine Anointed,' sang the Psalmist, and the author of Lamentations calls the king 'the breath of our nostrils, the Anointed of the Lord.' This Old Testament conception of the anointed king as a sacred person was taken over by some of the early Church Fathers, and transmitted by them into the Christian Church. S. Augustine, for example, is greatly impressed by the fact that David would not lift his hand against Saul, because Saul was the Lord's Anointed, and in discussing the incident he calls the royal anointing a sacrament. Nor did Gregory the Great take a less exalted view of royal unction. *Quia vero ipsa unctio sacramentum est, is qui promovetur bene foris unquitur si intus virtute sacramenti roberetur.* Hence arose in the West the belief that the king, by virtue of the sacrament of unction, was a sacred person. Hence a church council held at Chelsea in 787 A.D. declared that to plot against the king's life was especially wicked because the king was the Lord's Anointed (Haddam & Stubbs: *Councils*, vol. iii, p. 454).

Because the king was consecrated or ordained[2] to his office, he was not only the supreme governor of the state but also supreme governor of the Church. In order to realize how completely the king was governor of the Church, we need only turn to the Emperor Charlemagne (724—814). Charlemagne was an ecclesiastical no less than a civil ruler, summoning and presiding over Church Councils, examining and appointing bishops, settling by Capitularies the smallest points of Church discipline and polity. In 794 A.D. he presided over and directed the deliberations of the Council of Frankfort which condemned the decrees of the Second Council of Nicaea, although those decrees had been approved by the Pope. He altered the liturgy and the music of the Church, he introduced a new book of homilies and ordered special fasts and services whenever he thought proper.[3] 'That which stands out most clearly,' writes Lord Bryce in his *History of the Holy Roman Empire*, 'is the connection of the empire with religion . . . No better illustrations can be desired than those to be found in the Office for the imperial coronation at Rome. The rites prescribed in it are rites of consecration to a religious office: the Emperor, besides the sword globe and sceptre of temporal power, receives a ring as the symbol of his faith, is ordained as subdeacon, assists the Pope in celebrating Mass, partakes as a clerical

[2] Adamnan relates how Columba, shortly before 600 A.D., ordained Aidan to be King of Dal Riata, *i.e.* roughly modern Argyle. *'Aidanum in regem ordinavit . . . imponensque manum super caput ejus ordinans benedixit.' Vita S. Columbae, Lib.* iii, c. vi.

[3] Charlemagne insisted on inserting the *filioque* clause into the Nicene Creed in spite of the Pope's protest.

person of the communion in both kinds, is admitted a canon of S. Peter and of S. John Lateran.' At his coronation the Emperor was first invested with amice, alb and girdle, then led to the Pope who made him a clerk, *facit eum clericum*, and thereupon he was vested with tunic, dalmatic, pluviale, mitre, buskins and sandals, and anointed on the right arm and shoulders by the Bishop of Ostia (the prelate privileged to consecrate the Pope) with the oil of catechumens.[4] That this unction was held to be a sacrament and consequently indelible was maintained by the Emperor Henry IV when, in 1075, Pope Hildebrand claimed the power of deposing him, for the Emperor argued that no one could deprive him of an office which had been conferred upon him by the sacrament of unction, otherwise it would be possible for the other sacraments also to lose their indelibility.

The King of France, the 'Eldest Son of the Church,' was also of the clergy, for he was anointed with a miraculous oil brought down from heaven by a dove for the baptism of Clovis. This legend was fully credited by the twelfth century, and from this sacred oil, which was kept in the Abbey of S. Remi in Rheims, a tiny drop was added to the chrism or cream with which the king was anointed. The king, as a cleric, communicated in both kinds and was made *premier chanoine* of the primatial church of Lyons, as well as a canon of other churches. Jean Juvenal, Archbishop of Rheims (1449—1473) wrote to Charles VII: '*Au regard de vous, mon Souveran Seigneur, vous n' estes pas simplement personne laye, mais Prelat Ecclesiastique le premier en vostre Royaume, qui soit aprés le Pape, le bras dextre de l'Eglise.*' In two respects the King of England fell behind his royal brother of France, for the King of England neither communicated in two kinds nor did he hold a canonry.[5]

If the King of France was made a clerk by his anointing, so also was the King of England, for the French coronation service was based upon that of England. In fact, so closely did the French service copy the English that a curious result ensued. In the Anglo-Saxon service of 973 A.D. (the 'Edgar' service) the king is described as raised to the throne of the Angles or Saxons, and prayer is made 'that the sceptre may not depart from the royal throne of the Saxons, Mercians and Northumbrians' (*Saxonum*

[4] *Coronatio Romana.* Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica,* Vol. II. *Legum,* p. 189.

[5] It is true that the King of England is a Canon of S. David's Cathedral, but this only dates from Tudor times and has nothing to do with the King's consecration. The Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford, although a layman, was from 1617 to 1855 a Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral. The prebend was annexed by James I to the professorship to augment the stipend.

Merciorum, Nordanymbrorum), and these identical words actually appear in French coronation services as late as 1364, so that whilst the King of France was fighting against the English, the French coronation service contained a prayer that the sceptre might not depart from the royal throne of his enemies!

Our own coronation service goes back to the tenth century, and that the sacring of the king was regarded as a sacrament in those days is evident from the writing of Abbo (died 1004 A.D.), at one time a teacher in Ramsey Abbey, and afterwards Abbot of the famous French Abbey of Fleury. Abbo wrote a life of Edmund, King of East Anglia, and dedicated the book to his friend S. Dunstan. In this book he makes King Edmund speak of the three sacraments which he had received, the sacraments of baptism, confirmation and of royal unction, in such a way as to imply that the sacrament of royal unction was on a level with those of baptism and confirmation. That royal unction was held to be a sacrament in the eleventh century is shown by such a 'high churchman' as Cardinal Peter Damiani, friend and colleague of Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand), for in a sermon on the sacraments, Peter Damiani says that there are twelve sacraments and '*quintum est unctio regis*' (Migne, P.L. Vol. 144, col. 899).

There is no doubt that up to this time, the Church regarded the anointing of the king as a sacrament. The first serious opposition to this view came from Pope Hildebrand. Hildebrand determined to abolish royal control over the Church. Hitherto a newly-appointed bishop had received his ring and crozier, symbols of his office, from the king. This was intolerable to Hildebrand and he strictly forbade the practice. Such investiture, he said, must cease on the grounds that the king was only a layman. These novel Hildebrandine ideas were introduced into England by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, but in some quarters, at least, they met with vigorous opposition. The strongest champion of the clerical status of the king was an anonymous writer of York who, in a work entitled *De Consecratione Pontificum et Regum*, very cleverly analysed the English coronation service and showed that the service for the consecration of the king was analogous to that for the consecration of a bishop. He dwells on the fact that both are consecrated with cream or chrism, and after dwelling on the parallelism between the two forms of consecration, declares that the King of England is in the place of Christ able to remit sins and to reconcile sinners, '*potest exequi in remittendis peccatis et reconciliatione peccatoris.*' And then he proceeds:

> 'To all these things he is consecrated and sanctified. But by all these things it is shown that he himself, by the grace given to him by God, is

able to justify and to save men's bodies and souls, and by this he is made the justifier and the saviour of men.' [6]

This is the strongest claim ever made for the clerical status of the King of England. Indeed, it would be difficult to imagine a stronger claim, and one can only wonder how this writing escaped the notice of Henry VIII!

One result of the introduction of these novel Hildebrandine ideas into England was a revision of the Coronation Service, probably by Anselm himself, shortly after 1100 A.D., in which anointing with chrism was dropped and an inferior oil, *oleum catechumenorum*, was substituted. There were three ceremonial oils blessed annually on Maundy Thursday, *viz.* the Oil of the Sick, the Oil of Catechumens and the Chrism or Cream, that is, a compound of oil and balm used, among other purposes, for baptism, confirmation, the ordering of priests and the consecrating of bishops. The substitution of the oil of catechumens for the more sacred chrism was obviously intended to lessen the significance of the royal unction, and in 1204 Pope Innocent III laid it down that the Emperor was not to be anointed on the head, but only on the arm and back, and he was to be anointed with oil only, and not with chrism.[7] This attempt to lower the significance of the anointing of the king was the easier because it was just at this time, towards the end of the twelfth century, that the Church was becoming familiar with the idea of limiting the sacraments to seven, and the unction of the king was not included in the seven. Perhaps it was this attempt to rob the royal unction of its ancient significance which led Henry III to ask Robert Grosseteste, the learned Bishop of Lincoln, in what respect he took precedence of kings who had not been anointed. The Bishop of Lincoln seems to have had some difficulty in replying. Trained in scholastic theology and a student of Canon Law, he was bound to uphold the papal decretals. On the other hand, imbued with English political ideas, he was unwilling to lower the status of the king. Consequently he took a middle course. The anointing, he replied, was a sacrament and bestowed the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit upon the king, but it in no way placed the royal dignity on an equality with the priestly, nor did it confer power to perform any sacerdotal office.

It is the fourteenth century Coronation Service which exhibits most clearly the clerical character of the king. There are two

[6] These remarkable words will be found in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et Pontificum*, 3, *Tractatus Eboracenses* iv, p. 677.

[7] Dante warns his readers against Decretalists who 'disparage the power of the Empire.' *De Monarchia, Bk.* iii, 3. Church's translation, p. 261.

recensions of this service, an earlier prepared for the coronation of Edward II in 1308 and contained in the *Liber Regalis*, and a later with more detailed rubrics, prepared for the coronation of Richard II in 1377, and contained in the Missal which Nicholas Lytlington, Abbot of Westminster (1362—1386) presented to the Abbey.[8] The *Liber Regalis* continued in use in Latin until the coronation of Queen Elizabeth, and in an English translation until the coronation of Charles II. Perhaps the most sigificant change introduced into this new service was the revival of the use of chrism, for in defiance of Canon Law, the Archbishop was ordered to anoint the king's head with chrism, and thus equality with the sacerdotal office was once more established. Richard II certainly regarded this anointing with chrism as conferring 'character' as truly as a similar anointing conferred 'character' upon a bishop, for when the sentence of deposition was passed on Richard 'he refused to renounce the spiritual honour of the royal character impressed upon him' (Stubbs), and the words which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of King Richard,

> 'Not all the waters in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm from an anointed king,'

are not mere rhetoric, but really express what Richard said.[9]

The ecclesiastical vestments prescribed for the king also exhibit clearly his clerical character, for, after his anointing, he was vested in a *colobium sindonis* or alb, a *tunica* or dalmatic (a vestment worn by subdeacon, deacon or bishop at Mass), the *armillae* worn like a stole, as well as buskins, hose or gloves, and like a bishop was presented with a ring. In fact, it would have been impossible for any man in the fourteenth or fifteenth century to look upon the king in his coronation vestments and not to think of him as in some way, of the ecclesiastical order. Froissart, indeed, describing the coronation of Henry IV, writes that 'the king was vested in the robes of the Church as a deacon, and then they shod him with shoes of red velvet like those of a prelate,' and a contemporary account of the coronation of Henry VI describes him 'vested as a bishop that should say Mass, with a dalmatic like a tunic and a stole about his neck, but not crossed, and sandalled

[8] The original Missal is still in the possession of the Abbey.

[9] *Vide* the Austin Friar, John Copgrave (1393-1464), *De Illustribus Henricis*, p. 107. '*Praemisit tamen idem rex protestationem quod noluit nec intendebat renunciare carecteribus animae suae impressis.*' Also John de Trokelowe, *Annales Henrici IV*, '*Respondit quod noluit renunciare spirituali honori characteris sibi impressi et inunctioni quibus renunciare non potuit nec ab hiis cessare.*'

and also with hosen and shoes and cope and gloves like a bishop.'[10] It is significant, too, that the rubric directed the king to make an offering of bread and wine like Melchizedek, '*imitando Melchisedech*,' for it will be remembered that Melchizedek was 'king and priest' (*Genesis* xiv, 18; *Psalm* cx, 4).

Not only did the ecclesiastical vestments of the king denote his clerical character, but certain of the prayers, too, imply that he was more than layman. The Archbishop prayed that the king might 'nourish and teach, defend and instruct thy church and people,' and also that he might be 'the mediator between the clergy and the laity,' *mediatorem cleri et plebis*.' It is this last phrase which suggests the true ecclesiastical position of the king, he is of the clergy as well as of the laity, and this is precisely what was meant by the fifteenth century phrase which described the king as '*persona mixta*.' William Lyndwood,[11] the great Canon Lawyer of the fifteenth century, says that according to some, the king is 'persona mixta,' although he himself did not hold this view. As a Canon Lawyer he was bound to support the Hildebrandine idea, but his statement is evidence that others, apparently the Civil Lawyers as opposed to the Canon Lawyers, held the king to be '*persona mixta*.'[12]

In the Western Church no attempt has ever been made to make belief in the sacrament of royal unction *de fide*, but it may be remarked in passing that such belief is *de fide* in the Eastern Church. On Orthodoxy Sunday, that is the first Sunday in Lent, notable heretics, such as Arius and Nestorius, are anathematized, and along with them are anathematized those 'who say that orthordox princes do not ascend their thrones by the special grace of God, and do not, at their unction, receive the gift of the Holy Ghost for the discharge of their great office.'

If by the sacrament of unction the king is consecrated, to what office is he consecrated? If he is neither bishop, priest nor deacon, and yet is not simply a layman, what is he? The answer is that he is consecrated to the office of *king*, an office the function of which is to govern not only the State but the Church also. He is, indeed, 'Visitor' of the Church of England. The duty of a Visitor is to

[10] Cott MS., *Nero*, C, iv.

[11] Lyndwood died in 1446 as Bishop of S. David's. His grave, covered by a modern slab, is in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey near the Chapter House door.

[12] Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice of the King's Bench in 1442, and a contemporary of Lyndwood, wrote: 'A king of England is held by the authority of the Church to be a *persona mixta*' (*Works*, Vol. I, p. 514).

see that the statutes of a society are duly observed. Thus, in the case of an Oxford college, the duty of the Visitor is to see that the college statutes are observed, and, if necessary, to intervene for that purpose. Centuries before Henry VIII, the king had governed the Church and had been consecrated to that office by the Church herself. The *title* 'Supreme Head' or 'Supreme Governor' was new, but the claims they implied were not. In fact, when Henry VIII claimed to be Supreme Head of the Church (or in the case of Elizabeth, Supreme Governor) he was only fulfilling his coronation oath, for every English king from William the Conqueror to James II, at his coronation, swore to maintain the Laws of Edward the Confessor. One of those laws (B. Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, xvii, p. 193) declared that

> 'the king is the Vicar of the Supreme King in order that he may govern the kingdom and the people of the Lord, and above all that he may govern Holy Church,' *super omnia sanctam ecclesiam regnet.*

To describe this government of the Church of England as Erastianism is wrong. It is not Erastianism but Regalism, for Erastianism is the government of the Church by the State, but Regalism, as defined by the *Oxford Dictionary*, is the government of the Church by the king. The king is not consecrated to any priestly function nor to any ministering of the Word and Sacraments, but he is consecrated to the task of government, to rule both Church and State. And as his rule is over the Church as well as over the State, it is right and proper that he should be of the clergy as well as of the laity. That he should be of the clergy is, as we have seen, contrary to the Canon Law as developed under Hildebrandine influence, but not contrary to pre-Hildebrandine Church practice and belief. Regalism is the law of England, and in any case in which the Canon Law comes into conflict with the Common Law of this country, the Canon Law is null and void.

WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH

(1602—1644)

By H. R. Chillingworth, M.A.

JUST three hundred years ago, in January 1644, there died at Chichester William Chillingworth, author of the once famous *Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*, a book which, according to Gibbon, who wrote about a century and a half after its publication, was 'still esteemed the most solid defence of the Reformation.' Hallam, writing in the first half of the nineteenth century, praised the work highly — its contents, not its arrangement — and declared that readers of the *Religion of Protestants* and of Bossuet's *Variations of the Protestant Churches* had read the strongest arguments for and against the reformed creed. The book had ceased to be generally read even in Hallam's time. Hallam doubted whether it was much read by the clergy, and to-day one may say confidently that few of the clergy know anything of it beyond its title. Controversy, unlike literature, can seldom hope for immortality, a controversialist being compelled to choose ground recognized by his opponent, a ground abandoned perhaps by the controversialists of the next generation.

Chillingworth's book is not exceptional in its assumptions, and its attraction for modern readers for this reason, if for no other, has declined; but it deals with a subject of abiding interest, the never-ceasing conflict between authority and reason, between the herd and the individual. On its religious side, as far as Europe was concerned, the conflict seemed to be finally decided in the seventeenth century. In a great part of northern Europe Protestantism appeared to be settled and safe; so safe that, in our time as well as in the last century, the intolerance shown even by the most liberal of seventeenth century Englishmen, when Catholicism was in question, has been regarded merely as evidence of our ancestors' general want of enlightenment. There was an unexpected renewal of interest in the conflict with Rome in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, but within a generation or two the vistas opened up by Wallace and Darwin reduced the importance of the Oxford Movement almost to ecclesiastical dimensions. Even the talent of Dean Church cannot nowadays make the movement appear more than an anachronism.

The Tractarians belittled or ignored the Protestantism of the English Church, and by means of their social position — they were

Oxford men of a century ago — they made the name Protestant unfashionable. It was left to lower middle-class Nonconformists and fanatical Orangemen. Among Church of England people, even among Evangelicals, the name was less and less used, and the Reformation struggle and its issue was tacitly classed among old, unhappy, far-off things and battles long ago.

The Oxford Movement had good in it; it gave due prominence to the historic aspect of British Christianity, checking excessive individualism; but the Tractarian outlook was in its way as limited as the Evangelical. Mark Pattison quoted A. P. Stanley (the Dean of later years) as saying 'How different the fortunes of the Church of England might have been if Newman had been able to read German.' But 'escapists' had no desire to face, through German or any other modern medium, the real problems of their time. They left a world predominantly Protestant for the dead world of Patristic Orthodoxy. It is high time to do justice to what they ignored; to the Protestantism to which the Church of England has owed its national standing and to which Churchmen owe their liberty of prophesying. Not for two centuries has there been a more favourable time for doing justice to it. The Totalitarian attack on our liberties has no doubt sent the historically-minded in search of parallels, and what parallel is to be found closer than that of the present world conflict and the seventeenth century struggle between Protestantism and the Counter-Reformation? For the first time since Culloden (1746) destroyed Rome's last hope of bringing England by force back to the Papal obedience, it has become possible fully to appreciate our ancestors' reasons for excluding Catholic worship from toleration; for their approval of the hanging of Jesuits, the execution of the Queen of Scots, the savage treatment of Catholic Ireland, and, on the other hand, to understand the popular adulation of Elizabeth.

Chillingworth was born in 1602, the year before that in which the great queen died. The Armada had been defeated fourteen years earlier, and the story of that great deliverance must have been often told even in inland Oxford, Chillingworth's native town. All through the queen's reign until 1588 England had been in grave danger, and when Philip of Spain sent his great fleet to sea, England's chance of independent survival seemed as slight as, in our own time, her chances seemed to every outsider after Dunkirk. She had no America to look to; on the European continent she had no friends who would help; beyond the Tweed, Scotland recovering from the effects of civil war was in no condition to support, even if inclined to support, the country which had just taken the life of a Scottish queen. And on England's western

flank was Ireland, where a majority filled with hatred of England's religion was waiting for an opportunity to unite with England's deadly enemy. No betting man in his senses would have given anything for England's chances.

In Chillingworth's boyhood, despite Gunpowder Treason, the fight for national existence had been won, but the fight for individual liberty was only beginning. The fight was one for internal or intellectual liberty and for external or political liberty, and not every one who fought for liberty fought for both kinds. Chillingworth, a lover of liberty if ever there was one, was a Royalist. He was, moreover, a Church of England clergyman, convinced that episcopacy, not presbyterianism, was of Apostolic origin — of Apostolic, not of higher origin. Episcopacy, though it had his ungrudging allegiance, seems to have been regarded by him almost from a utilitarian standpoint. He had the Englishman's dislike for radical change, and would keep what worked tolerably well in preference to what was theoretically superior. At the end of his days, some may think, he had no reason to love Presbyterianism as represented by Francis Cheynell, but before that time, one suspects, he had discovered, as Milton had, that new presbyter was but old priest writ large.

We know as much about his life — and that is not a great deal — as we know about the lives of most of the notable men of his time. The starry souls of that and earlier times necessarily dwelt apart, and biographers could not, if they wished to, give readers 'close-ups' of their subjects. Izaac Walton, Chillingworth's contemporary, did not include him in his *Lives*. His first biographer was a Frenchman, Pierre Des Maiseaux, one of the many clever Huguenots whom France lost through the bigotry of Louis the Fourteenth and Madame de Maintenon. His *Life of William Chillingworth* was published in 1725. Another *Life*, the work of Thomas Birch, was published in a series issued between 1734 and 1741. There are a few references to him by contemporaries, the most remarkable being the *Chillingworthi Novissima* of Francis Cheynell, of which something will be said later on.

The *Dictionary of National Biography* contains accounts of three Chillingworths, the author of the *Religion of Protestants* being the latest. All three had connexion with Oxford, and the form of the name makes it probable that the family originated in that part of England. William Chillingworth's father was a well-to-do business man who became Mayor of Oxford. He survived his son. He is reported to have sent a letter of thanks to Lieut. Golledge, the Parliamentarian to whose custody Chillingworth had been handed over after Arundel Castle had been lost by the

Royalists. The only other significant reference to him that I have found is contained in a letter written by his son from Lord Falkland's house in September 1635. William must have been short of money, and money, he wrote, 'came from his father's purse like blood from his veins.' In later years William must have been less dependent on the paternal humour, for at his death at the early age of 41, he left to the Mayor and Corporation of Oxford £400—£50 for eight years—as a fund for the help of young tradesmen. His father must have been in good standing among his townsmen, to judge from the fact that he was able to get William Laud, at the time Fellow of St. John's, to be his son's godfather. Laud took his duties seriously, and, except for a short period, seems to have had no reason to regret the spiritual relationship. It may, however, be doubted whether Chillingworth benefited much by the connexion. His enemies regarded him as Laud's spy, and it was said that accounts of talks with college acquaintances reported by him to Laud, then Bishop of London, brought trouble on one of the talkers. During the Civil War people on his own side called him the Queen's Intelligencer. Military men were no doubt glad to have someone to blame for their want of success; and a clergyman whose mental processes were a complete puzzle to them, a clergyman, moreover, who had taught them their business at the siege of Gloucester, and who had denounced their licentiousness in a sermon preached before the King, was likely enough to become a target for their ill-humour. But these angry soldiers can have known nothing of Chillingworth's controversies with the Jesuits when they accused him of spying for Henrietta Maria, who was surely the last person likely to employ him. There is indeed no proof that he spied for Queen or Bishop. He was a rationalist, though his ultimates would not be accepted by those who now claim the name. According to the late Professor Newport White (*Four Good Men*, p. 32) he was 'a bore, consumed with an insatiable desire to argue with anyone he might meet, or could catch.'

But, if he was that kind of man, it is extremely unlikely that he was ever even tempted to aid or abet his godfather in his barbarous dealings with religious opponents. Chillingworth, I feel sure, would have heartily agreed with the spirit of Milton's *Areopagitica* (published at the end of the year in which Chillingworth died), but he would have expressed his conclusions less lyrically. 'I have learned,' he says,

> 'from the ancient fathers of the Church, that nothing is more against religion than to force religion; and of St. Paul, the weapons of the Christian warfare are not carnal. And great reason: for human violence

may make men counterfeit, but cannot make them believe, and is therefore fit for nothing but to breed force without and atheism within.'

Forcing of conscience he leaves to Machiavellian statesmen,

'who believe no other creed but this: *Regi aut civitati imperium habenti nihil injustum quod utile* . . . But they that are indeed servants and lovers of Christ, of truth, of the church, and of mankind, ought with all courage to oppose it as a common enemy of all these.'

He goes on to say that

'there is no danger to any state from any man's opinion; unless it be such an opinion by which disobedience to authority, or impiety, is taught or licensed . . . or unless this sanguinary doctrine be joined with it, that it is lawful for him by human violence to enforce others to it.'

Protestants who persecuted he regarded as inexcusable; they would have been blessed

'had they chosen rather to be martyrs than murderers, and to die for their religion rather than to fight for it.'

But, if they fought for it — he had in mind probably the Swedish intervention in Germany — Roman Catholics were

'of all men in the world . . . the most unfit to accuse them.' 'The souls of the martyrs from under the altar cry out much louder' against the Romanists 'than against all other persecutors put together.' Romanists had 'for many ages together daily sacrificed hecatombs of innocent Christians, under the name of heretics, to their blind zeal and furious superstition.' They 'had taught plainly that they might propagate their religion whensoever they had power, by deposing of kings and invasion of kingdoms; and thought, when they killed the adversaries of it, they did God service.'[1]

He had better means of knowing the workings of the sacerdotal mind than most of his brethren. At Oxford, while he was Fellow of his college (Trinity), he had met a Jesuit who was known as Mr. Fisher, and had been induced by him to join the Roman Church. The Jesuits were busy at Oxford and elsewhere in England, and Protestants were becoming alarmed at their success. George Herbert saw Religion 'standing on tiptoe,' 'ready to pass to the American strand,' and Milton, in the year in which the *Religion of Protestants* was published, called attention to the depredations of a certain 'grim wolf' with privy paw which daily devoured apace, and with impunity. Chillingworth was only one of several young university men whom the Jesuit missionaries won over. But Fisher seems to have been too eager to exploit his triumph. He persuaded his convert to go to Douai, and in the Jesuit college there to put in writing the reasons for his change of religion. Fisher might have done better for his cause had he left Chillingworth among Protestants. Opposition might have con-

[1] *Religion of Protestants*, V, sect. 96.

firmed the convert in his new faith. The Douai environment had the opposite effect, and, after a brief stay, Chillingworth returned to England, and, about the year 1634 wrote an account of the reasons which had convinced him that he had taken a wrong step in joining the Roman Church. In the Tractarian times, it may be remembered, premature acquaintance with specimens of the Catholic literature of edification roused the critical faculty of J. A. Froude, and probably deprived Rome of a convert.

Chillingworth's *magnum opus* was published in 1637. It was in form a reply to a book entitled *Charity Mistaken*,[2] and to a pamphlet entitled *A Direction to be observed by N.N.* Both publications were the work of a Jesuit who went by the name of Edward Knott. *Charity Mistaken* was answered by Dr. Christopher Potter, Provost of Queen's College, and Chillingworth was preparing an answer to the Jesuit's reply to Potter when the *Direction* appeared. Knott apparently intended to queer Chillingworth's pitch by the issue of this pamphlet. Chillingworth was N.N., and Knott wished Church of England readers to know that the man who had returned to them from Douai was of doubtful orthodoxy. He was in fact no better than a Socinian. Knott, who maintained that 'Protestantism must of necessity induce Socinianism,' would no doubt have cheerfully brought the same charge against many of Chillingworth's brethren, but it served his purpose to treat his would-be opponent as an exception. And Chillingworth was in many respects exceptional. Though he had returned to the Church of England, he was not wholly in agreement with her tenets. He even let refusal to subscribe to the Articles stand in his way to preferment. To subscribe, he believed, would have been 'to subscribe to his own damnation.'[3] He could not conscientiously assent to the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian creed. He regarded them as 'most false, and in a high degree presumptuous and schismatical'; and believing that 'to say that the Fourth Commandment was a law of God appertaining to Christians was false and unlawful,' he could not accept the Book of Common Prayer without reservations. Like hundreds of puzzled clergymen since his time, he found an honest way out of his difficulties, but his changes and hesitations must have left him suspect in the eyes of those who had never doubted.

[2] *Charity Mistaken,* with the want whereof Catholics are unjustly charged, for affirming, as they do with grief, that Protestancy unrepented destroys Salvation.

[3] The Amended Subscription Act intended to relieve the consciences of scrupulous clergymen did not become law until 1865. *Cf.* A. P. Stanley's *Essays on Church and State,* IV and V.—Ed., *M.C.*

Chillingworth was one of the small group of thoughtful men who met at Tew, the Oxfordshire home of Lucius Cary, Lord Falkland. They were what we should call liberals — liberals in religion and politics at a time when liberalism was a particularly difficult creed to live up to. Compromise was everywhere breaking down, and only extremists were sure of a hearing. Chillingworth's uncritical acceptance of the Bible made it impossible for him to join those who lifted up their hands against the Lord's Anointed, but it is possible that he felt no happier than Falkland in the company of rowdy Cavaliers. He was in the Royal army at the siege of Gloucester where, it is said, he advised the use of engines devised by himself on Roman models. The raising of the siege by Essex seems to have prevented their being fully tested. Soon after, he was among the Royalists who surrendered to Sir William Waller at Arundel Castle. He was in wretched health, and being too ill to be taken to London, he was conveyed to Chichester about eleven miles away, where he died soon after. He was buried in the cathedral.

His life during those last weeks at Chichester has been described in some detail by Francis Cheynell in his curious book *Chillingworthi Novissima*. Cheynell, a former Fellow of Merton College, was a fanatical Presbyterian, narrow-minded and, like many narrow-minded men, logical. In Spain he might have been a Torquemada but for the fact that he had a good heart. Intellectually he was poles apart from Chillingworth, but intellectual differences did not prevent him from doing what he could for the sick man's comfort. It was partly due to his representations that Chillingworth was spared the long journey to London; and at Chichester, though he lost no opportunity of showing the heretic the error of his ways, he treated him almost as a man and a brother. He must have felt rewarded when Chillingworth acknowledged that the Parliamentary soldiers were better Christians than the King's men, and when he went so far as to admit that the Parliament's intentions were preferable to those of the Court, even though he added that the Parliament had not gone the right way in carrying out its policy. War, he said, was not the way of Jesus Christ. I doubt whether Chillingworth, sick man as he was, suffered much from Cheynell's ceaseless arguing; it is even possible that the discussions lightened the burden of illness. His opponent took no mean advantages. When Chillingworth had listened to a long statement of his views, Cheynell invited him to reserve his reply till their next meeting when, as seemed likely, he should be fitter for argumentation. On another occasion Cheynell offered to pray publicly for the invalid, and on getting

Chillingworth's grateful consent, desired the cathedral congregation on the following day to pray for 'a sick prisoner in the city, a man very eminent for the strength of his parts, the excellency of his gifts, and the depth of his learning.' It is curious to observe the conflict between Cheynell's head and heart. While Chillingworth was alive, Cheynell's natural goodness prevailed, but, as soon as he was dead, his opponent's Calvinistic conscience began to reassert itself. It would not let him officiate at the funeral, though a still small voice urged him to do so, and it drove him to make a spectacular protest against the dead man's errors. He appeared at the graveside clasping in his arms the *Religion of Protestants*, a large volume, I dare say (judging from the size of an ancient copy in the possession of modern Chillingworths), and flung this into the grave, the fittest resting-place for such a book.

If he had been able to treat *all* copies similarly, his action at the graveside would have been disastrous and not merely theatrical. For the *Religion of Protestants*, though no longer read, did a notable service in its day. The author, like the Protestant Reformers, is open to the charge of having substituted the infallibility of a book for the infallibility of the Church; but, in claiming for all honest readers the right to interpret the Bible, he claimed for them what was virtually complete freedom. The Jesuits saw what such a claim led to, and accused him of defending Protestantism by 'destructive' means. Chillingworth's reply was no better than a quibble: his arguments, he said, were necessarily destructive; he could build nothing, Christianity having been already built. Like other men who have followed reason rather than tradition, Chillingworth had travelled farther than he suspected. He was honestly indignant at being called a Socinian. He was not a Socinian, but he acted as the Socinians in leaving the Bible to individual interpretation. *Rationalist*, in our sense of the word, was not yet in general use, and *Socinian* did very well for the purpose of discrediting a dangerous opponent. He was called Latitudinarian by later generations of Churchmen, and, if he had lived in the nineteenth century, he would have been a Broad Churchman of the Whately type. In our days he would no doubt be a Modernist, but whether a Churchman, is not so certain.

WILLIAM DOUGLAS MORRISON

(1852—1943)

BY the death of Dr. Morrison owing to a street accident on December 13, 1943, at the age of 91, the cause of Liberal Churchmanship has lost an able and devoted leader. When the Modern Churchmen's Union (then known as the Churchmen's Union) was inaugurated in 1898, Morrison was one of its original founders and became its President in the first decade of the twentieth century. Its Executive in those days included the Rev. A. W. Hutton, Rector of Bow Church (the first biographer of Cardinals Manning and Newman), Canon Papillon, Lord Avebury, Dr. Rashdall, Prof. Percy Gardner, Dr. R. B. Tollinton, the Rev. C. R. Shaw-Stewart, Prof. Caldecott, P. H. Bagenal and Sir C. Thomas Dyke-Acland, who succeeded Morrison as President.

In 1904 Morrison founded the *Liberal Churchman* (a quarterly review published by Williams and Norgate), but resigned the editorship in 1908 when the Crown appointed him Rector of St. Marylebone, a post he held for thirty-three years. The *Liberal Churchman* expired in July, 1908, but not before it had ably expounded those principles to which the *Modern Churchman*, its successor, has been consistently loyal. The following extract from the first editorial of the *Liberal Churchman* (November, 1904) might, we venture to think, have been written by the Editor of the *Modern Churchman* in March, 1944.

> 'The decay of interest in the Church as a teaching institution which is such a marked and significant sign of the times, is in many quarters attributed to a decay of interest in religion itself. This is another form of the fallacy which persists in identifying religion with traditional ecclesiastical formulas. The Church as a visible institution is the official and accredited instrument of the Christian community for propagating the Christian faith, but it is not the Christian faith itself. Its ministers, its worship, its ceremonial, its devotions, its doctrines are all instruments—external agents for propagating and developing a great inward and unseen reality, but they are not this reality itself. We refuse to believe that religion is decadent because there is at present a manifest decay of interest in the Church.' . . . .
>
> 'The most pressing task of modern theology is to liberate this religious experience from traditional theories which make it dependent on infallible institutions, infallible books, and infallible doctrines. It is these theories which bring religion into conflict and collision with modern conceptions of the world and life.'

Morrison was born in 1852 and was educated at Glenalmond. He was given the Hon. LL.D. of St. Andrews in 1898. Ordained

in 1877, he spent fifteen years of his early ministerial life as a prison chaplain in Bradford and Wandsworth. In this sphere he did most valuable work which led to reforms in our prison system, especially in the treatment of young criminals, and earned for him public commendation by Lord Haldane. Morrison's researches and recommendations were published in two books, *Crime and its Causes* (1890) and *Juvenile Offenders* (1896). The findings of these books were not based solely on Morrison's personal experience. He was a profound student of the literature of criminology. The writer of this tribute to a friend realized this when, some years later, being presented by Morrison with a number of continental volumes on criminology, he offered them to the Bodleian Library, which accepted a dozen of them. Morrison's *Juvenile Offenders* was translated into German in 1907 and was commended highly by the German press of those days.

He also contributed one of the best volumes in the series *The Story of the Nations* on *The Jews under Roman Rule*. For some years he acted as editor of the *Theological Translation Library*, which did valuable work in introducing English readers to outstanding contributions made by contemporary Continental scholars to Theology, Church History and Biblical Criticism.

His literary labours, but not his studies, came to an end when he became Rector of St. Marylebone. Here he did much to make his parish schools the most efficient of their kind in the London Diocese. Striking in appearance, debonair, well-groomed, a forcible speaker, calm and dignified in manner, a sound administrator, he was an ideal rector of a great metropolitan parish. He certainly ought to have received promotion; but he was not popular with his Diocesan, and promotion outside London he would not have accepted. Like Dr. Johnson's Scotchman, he loved London and possessed a large circle of friends in the metropolis. He was a member of the Reform Club, an ardent political Liberal and a great admirer of Asquith. As a member of the Committee of the London Library he added to his public services.

He was a large-minded and great-hearted Christian; a fearless champion of sound learning among the clergy; an active, practical, judicious philanthropist, without cant, without fads, without self-seeking.

H.D.A.M.

A MOTHERING SUNDAY MEDITATION

By the Rev. Gamaliel Milner, M.A., Vicar of Werrington, Launceston, author of *The Problem of Decadence*, etc.

ON the Fourth Sunday in Lent—known in our old English world as Mothering Sunday, because on that day servants and apprentices were allowed to visit their homes and took presents to their mother and received presents from her—a passage of no ordinary interest (*Galatians* iv, 21-31) is read as the Epistle for the day. Whether the fact that the Epistle for the day containing the appropriate phrase 'the mother of us all' was an additional reason for the mid-Lent Sunday being called Mothering Sunday is or is not correct does not matter for our present purpose. What we are concerned with is the extraordinary significance of the passage selected for the Epistle. We are never able to read it without murmuring to ourselves, 'This is certainly the most successful prediction in history'; 'almost thou persuadest me to be a Fundamentalist.'

Yet in modern times this strange glimpse of things to come has been refused its due meed of admiration. Matthew Arnold, who saw as far into the mind of the Apostle as most men, speaks depreciatingly of 'hammering out an allegory about Hagar,' and the orthodox Canon Cockin talks about 'Rabbinical crabbedness': and, to crown it all, the hypersensitive editors of the *Deposited Book* decided that Mothering Sunday would be better without mother, and so have provided an alternative Epistle.

> 'Abraham,' says St. Paul, 'had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman . . . which things are an allegory: for these two women are two covenants, the one from the Mount Sinai, bearing children into bondage, which is Hagar. For this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to the Jerusalem that now is: for she is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.'

From the religion of the Old Covenant there have sprung the Religion of Freedom and the Religion of Slavery. The Religion of Freedom is, of course, the Christian Religion, even although many of its adherents fail to recognize this. The religion of slavery is the religion of Islam, spread by those who boast themselves to be the descendants of Ishmael, the son of the bondwoman. The slavery of the sons of Ishmael is two-fold: (1) slavery to the letter of the *Quran*, every word of which was inspired by Allah; (2) slavery to Allah, the God of the *Quran*. Islam means 'submission,' resignation' to God. A 'Muslim' means one who has submitted,

resigned himself to God. Allah is our master, we are his slaves; He is a kindly, compassionate, indulgent master to those who are His resigned and submissive slaves.

On their triumphant march across North Africa our armies were halted at the Wadi Zemzem. The water-course was called, doubtless, after the celebrated well of the same name at Mecca, the drinking of whose water (somewhat brackish to the taste but spiritually refreshing) is incumbent on all pilgrims to the Holy City. This, the pious *Hadji* is told, is the well of water at which Hagar, ancestress of the Arab race, filled her bottle at the command of the angel of the Lord and gave drink to the child Ishmael, when, wearied of wandering in the wilderness of Beersheba, she had cast him down in despair under a thorn-shrub. The *Quran* tells us that in subsequent years Abraham, Ishmael and Isaac laid hard by the foundations of the Holy Kaaba and prayed,

> 'O Lord, make us Muslims and our posterity a people of Muslims' (*Surah:* 'The Cow').

It has been suggested in the name of religious comprehensiveness that liberally minded Muhammadans could join with liberally minded Christians in praying together the Lord's Prayer. We doubt if this is possible.[1] We fear the Muhammadans would be brought to a stop by the first word, 'Abba,' 'Father.' The shortest *Surah* in the *Quran* is entitled, 'The Declaration of God's Unity'; according to a tradition of the Prophet it is equal in value to a third part of the sacred volume.

> 'He is one God, the Eternal God, He begetteth not, neither is He begotten, and there is not anyone like unto Him.'

It is clear from the whole tenour of the *Quran* that Muhammad meant emphatically to negative the notion of any sort or kind of filial relationship to God. The transcendent character of Allah, His complete 'otherness' from all created beings, is one of the distinctive notes of Islam. It distinguishes Islam not only from Christianity but from Paganism. St. Paul in his oft-quoted speech at Athens cited the heathen poet who said, 'For we are also His offspring.' Our Saxon ancestors spoke of 'Odin Allfather.' To those who thought of God as a magnified man there was no difficulty in ascribing fatherhood, even physical fatherhood, to Zeus. Hecataeus, the predecessor of Herodotus as historian, boasted that he was fifteenth in descent from Zeus. Teutonic royalties traced their pedigrees from Odin. It is easy enough to believe in the Fatherhood of God, so long as we conceive of Him on anthropo-

[1] We have received a considered judgement from a very distinguished representative of Islam that it would be possible for a Muslim to join with Christians in saying the Lord's Prayer, provided that it were understood that a Muslim in so doing does not interpret the words of that prayer in a way which conflicts with the fundamental affirmations of Islam.—Ed., *M.C.*

morphic lines; it is not so easy, when we think of Him as the High and Holy One that inhabiteth Eternity. The Christian's Lord's Prayer begins, 'Our Father, which art in heaven.' The Muslim's Lord's Prayer begins, 'Praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures.'

Muhammad never put himself forward as the founder of a new religion. He is never weary of repeating that the religion to which he calls the Meccans is the one true faith, the Religion of Adam and Abraham, of Moses and Jesus. Indeed, a specious case can be made out for the view that Islam, not Christianity, is the legitimate heir of Judaism. Renan described Islam as 'petrified Judaism.' Spengler supports the view in his impressive and preposterous *Decline of the West*. Islam arose and flourished among Semites; Christianity from an early period showed a tendency to move West into the Hellenistic and Latin sphere of culture. Historically speaking, Christianity is a synthesis of the religion of Israel (as developed by the Jewish prophets) and the philosophy of Plato.[2] Few people, perhaps, are aware of the extent of the Platonic element in our spiritual ancestry. From Plato rather than from Moses comes the belief in the immortality of the soul, first clearly proclaimed in the Old Testament in the *Book of Wisdom*—the one book in the Old Testament which shows unmistakeable traces of Greek philosophy. The Christian Church took over the Old Testament without much enthusiasm; the Gnostics would have dropped it altogether; and by Patristic writers it was so transformed by allegorizing interpretations that its original meaning was largely obscured. Hebrew, little studied by Christian scholars, became almost entirely unknown after the fifth century, to be rediscovered by the Christian Church in the sixteenth century. Not till the Reformation did the Old Testament become known by the Christian laity, and many aspects of it remained undiscovered till the nineteenth century.

The claim that Islam is the true heir to Judaism, that it is Judaism universalized and freed from tiresome and obsolete restrictions, is tenable. It has found its natural centre in Semitic lands; it has become the religion of the ancient East. Maimonides, the great exponent of liberal Judaism, taught that under certain circumstances a Jew might conform to another religion, but laid it down that for him to pretend to be a Muslim was less criminal than to feign Christianity. A Jew who turned Muslim merely had to acknowledge a false prophet: one who professed himself a Christian denied the unity of God. This assumption by Maimonides that Christians deny the unity of God is directly contradicted by the opening words of our great Conciliar Creed:

'I believe in one God, the Father Almighty.'

[2] See W. R. Inge's *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought*.

Unfortunately, Trinitarian orthodoxy has developed into tritheism for vast multitudes of Christians.

Yet however plausible may seem the affiliation of Islam to the religion of Abraham, there is a deeper sense in which, without concurring in all the fine-drawn arguments of St. Paul or the forensic audacities of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, we feel in our bones that we Christians are the true heirs of Israel, that 'in Isaac shall thy seed be called.' There is in the Old Testament something which is not in the *Quran*, a deep sense of God's holiness, a yearning for communion with Him. Islam is really to-day an outlandish religion; for a long time Islam has been seeking its proselytes among black and brown and yellow men, 'lesser breeds without the law' (and the Gospel). 'Proper pride'—race prejudice, if you like—will save us from this sort of apostasy.

There are other ways in which we may adopt the religion of Ishmael. His spiritual descendants hold that man is the slave of God, or, if you prefer it, the creature of circumstances. The servant knoweth not what his lord doeth. Ours not to reason why, ours but to do and die. The universe is irrational.

It is possible, *pace* the Rationalist Association, to combine a disbelief in God's existence with a thoroughly irrational outlook. Dialectical materialism, which is the philosophy of militant atheism in Russia and elsewhere, lays it down as axiomatic that what we are pleased to call our opinions are merely the reflection of our interests. For example, of the two Jewish economists who influenced the nineteenth century, Ricardo was a rich stockbroker and believed in capital, Marx was a poor journalist who wrote a book to prove that capital was the root of all evil. Whether Marx would have accepted this account of the origin of his dialectics is uncertain; all orthodox Marxists must.

To go to the opposite pole, there are many indications to-day that what is commonly called Fundamentalism is by no means so dead as intellectuals would like to believe. Scientists and scholars are distressed to find that doctrinal systems which were intellectually bankrupt in the 1860's have by no means gone out of business and are even showing signs of revival. We see the same phenomenon in the economic sphere, where impious disbelief in the multiplication table is shockingly prevalent.

But, after all, what St. Paul was actually thinking about when he wrote to the Galatians was a party strong in the Christian Church from the first and frequently dominant. He called its adherents Judaizers, 'the Circumcision.' The mass movement which followed the preaching of St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost had swamped the tiny band of our Lord's disciples with a great multitude of converts zealous for the Law: there were Pharisees which

believed, a great company of priests obedient to the faith. Naturally enough, they wished to carry on the age-long traditions of their fathers. The introduction of Gentile converts, viewed at first as a necessary evil, soon presented itself as a splendid opportunity for creating a Greater Israel, a world-wide community with its centre at Jerusalem. The tragedy of St. Paul's life was that he had to maintain a war on two fronts. On the one hand he had to fight paganism outside the Christian Church; and on the other hand he had to fight Judaism inside the Christian Church. When he died it was by no means clear that the battle was won. The tradition preserved in the Pastoral Epistles shows us a lonely old man in prison from whom nearly all his converts had turned away. The scanty records of the sub-Apostolic period make Peter, not Paul, the central figure. Rome succeeded to the inheritance of Jerusalem.

But it is not Rome nor Mecca nor Moscow which is the real enemy. The conflict between the Religion of the Spirit and the Religion of the Letter is perennial. It is a fratricidal conflict latent in every form of religious organization; a man's foes are those of his own household; it is a family quarrel, Isaac against Ishmael. And it cannot be ended once for all under the conditions of our earthly life, because the authoritarians are so right — up to a point. Authority there must be: discipline is indispensable: man lives by obedience. None the less is it true that the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.

BOOK REVIEWS

A GREAT AND GENEROUS EPISCOPATE*

Thus, on his retirement, Dr. Henson's eighteen-and-a-half years' tenure of the see of Durham was described by those best able to judge; and it is most unlikely that any reader of this autobiographical record of that period will be moved to dissent. Declining any presentation, he declared with characteristic realism,

> 'If a man has done his duty, a testimonial is obviously superfluous; if he has not, it can only be satirical';

but it is significant that there came to him on that occasion a greeting of sympathy and goodwill from the diocese of Hereford, over which he had presided for little more than two years in circumstances which began in suspicion and continued in difficulty. The book is frank, self-revealing, illuminating, instructive, a truly human document written in the style in which its author wields a master pen. More, perhaps, than any of his activities in matters ecclesiastical, his practical concern with the unemployment and hardships in his industrial diocese shows the character of the man and the

* *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life,* Vol. II, by Herbert Hensley Henson. (Oxford University Press. Pp. xvi and 432. Price 21/- net. 1943.)

conscientiousness of the bishop. A man of moods, by nature most kindly, ever alive to facts, with a hatred of cant, sensitive to unfair criticism or unfounded suspicion, expressing himself with an often brutal frankness (never resented but rather appreciated when repaid in kind), painfully conscious of isolation when maintaining unpopular positions, yet ill at ease and self-questioning if applauded by any considerable body of opinion — no man was less adapted to what his friend Dr. Inge called the rôle of court chaplain to King Demos. Dr. Henson is the embodied disproof of his own words that it is absurd to connect independence with any bishopric.

Anybody who publishes some 750 pages about what he describes as 'an unimportant life' invites judgement upon it; this consequence Dr. Henson would be the last to resent, though he might with reason observe that 'with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you.' It has been asked why so brilliant a man who held such influential positions did not impress a greater mark on the Church of his generation. Those who ask it seldom inquire what kind of influence he could fairly be expected to exercise in his circumstances. In this respect I think he will not suffer in comparison with any comparable contemporary bishop. Alike as a parochial clergyman, cathedral dignitary, and bishop he read much more widely than is common in any of those positions. He possesses a very competent knowledge of history. But he is not, nor ever claimed to be, a professional philosopher or theologian whose word would carry great weight in those realms. His interests have always been in ecclesiastical and practical affairs, about which he informed himself with much care. This book discloses many influential and eminently wise contributions made during the two Lambeth Conferences he attended, his efforts to improve the rather depressing standard of clerical competence which he found in his northern diocese, the immense pains taken in preparing his Quadrennial Charges and all his sermons; and though, with evident rightness, he deliberately chose not to neglect that which came upon him daily, the care of his diocese, in order that he might attend more regularly in the House of Lords, no bishop was heard with more attention and effect in that highly discriminating assembly.

But his was not the temperament essential to a successful leader in modern ecclesiastical affairs, in whom (and particularly nowadays) it is a weakness that he should see, or at any rate publicly recognize, too many aspects of any issue. Brilliant phrase-maker though he is, his speeches and writings have never been directed to the gallery nor properly understood there. He also happened to care much for and to espouse causes but little accounted of in his generation. 'An old-fashioned "Latitude man" who had strayed from the seventeenth century into the twentieth' is his chosen self-description, and is not misleading. And many will still refuse to accept as a depreciatory criticism of any man that he cared more for things that endure than for the transitory gods of the hour. Respected though he was, his caustic wit in tongue and pen inevitably tended to evoke a kind of fear rather than love and loyalty, except (and it is an important exception) among those privileged to know him well. Some regarded him as a kind of Bernard Shaw among the bishops, with a tendency to turn and rend those who would account him a leader to follow.

> 'It has been my misfortune in the course of my life to disappoint every person who has followed me, and every party that has allowed itself to build hopes upon me.'

A little exaggerated, perhaps, though not untrue; but is it merely 'misfortune'?

Perhaps Dr. Henson's greatest mistake was in signing, and allowing to be published, the letter to him and the reply, both written by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Davidson), towards the end of the acute controversy evoked

by his nomination to the see of Hereford. It is surprising that Dr. Henson has not thought it necessary or desirable to print the letters,[1] though he does print the one sentence he himself added to the drafts — a sentence which, with every sympathy for his desire to protest against a 'suggestion' of personal dishonour, is not otherwise relevant. Nor does he show his usual precision in adding 'The "suggestion," ' of course, was that I didn't believe the Creeds.' For it was not suggested that he did not claim to believe the doctrine of the Incarnation, or that our Lord was truly born, or that He survived death. The specific charge made by Dr. Henson's opponents was that he did not believe that Jesus was born of a virgin mother or that His physical body rose from the tomb. To those who alleged these named unbeliefs the Archbishop wrote:

> 'I reply to them that they are misinformed, and that I am persuaded that when you repeat the words of the Creed you do so *ex animo* and without any desire to change them.'

Dr. Henson's reply was quite unqualified:

> 'Of course what you say is absolutely true.'

Unless words are to be deprived of their customary meanings there is no escape from certain conclusions: first, that Dr. Henson did believe those clauses of the Creed in the plain, natural and historical sense of their words; and secondly, that in many references to these subjects in earlier published statements Dr. Henson was claiming and defending for others a liberty of interpretation which he felt no need to exercise for himself. This, of course, is absolutely honest. Nobody produced evidence that the Bishop-elect had *denied* these articles of the Creed. There is no ground for any suggestion that he compromised conscience or in any way 'recanted' in order to smooth the path to the episcopate.

Wherein, then, lay the mistake in accepting the Archbishop's letters? Until he did so, Dr. Henson had maintained public silence. Quite properly in private he took the line that he stood by his published words. He rightly felt that any new public declaration made at that moment might well be misconstrued. This was precisely the consequence of the letters, alike among his supporters and opponents. Many in both groups drew the inevitable conclusion clearly stated in Bishop Gore's letter in which he withdrew his protest against the consecration:

> 'I consider myself now entitled to declare that Dr. Henson believes what I thought he disbelieved, and affirms *ex animo* what I thought he did not affirm.'[2]

But a section of the opposition, unlike Dr. Gore, was *not* satisfied, *and Dr. Henson knew it*. He knew that these people would pay particular attention to his future utterances and be not slow to make the most of any suggestion of insincerity or tergiversation. As a defender of reasonable liberty the new Bishop's style was cramped by something besides his office. The cause of liberty received a set-back, when a refusal to accept the Archbishop's draft letters would have advanced it; and Dr. Henson could not thereafter at all easily fill the rôle for which by conviction, courage, temperament and ability he was eminently fitted. His action released the Archbishop from the difficult position in which Gore and Co. had placed him, and also placated

[1] They may be found on p. 874 of Bell's *Randall Davidson*, second edition. It is more surprising that in his second volume, p. 314, Dr. Henson should write: 'After the Archbishop had finally decided to consecrate, I thought it sufficient to reaffirm both my *ex animo* acceptance of the Nicene Creed *and the agnostic attitude towards certain of its "historical" clauses which conditioned that acceptance.*' (Italics mine.) I hope I am not unfair, but I can find no such statement as the words italicised in any published document of that date.

[2] G. K. A. Bell, *ibid.*, p. 878.

some influential protesters, when it would have been for the enduring good of the Church of England that the one should not have been so released nor the other thus placated.

This unhappy controversy obviously and naturally caused Dr. Henson acute suffering, with continuing effects. One finds that fifteen years later he still seems to think he was regarded as 'essentially heretical' and, when an eminent Unitarian was invited to the pulpit of Liverpool Cathedral, writing 'it was widely expected that I should applaud the arrangement.' This may have been so, though I should be surprised to discover that anyone at Liverpool gave a single thought to that aspect of the matter.

> 'I thought I owed it to myself to clear away any misunderstanding as to my own personal belief which, if I maintained an ambiguous silence, might very naturally be suspected.'

Why? In the storm about his consecration no considerable person suggested that Dr. Henson did not believe sincerely the doctrine of the Incarnation. Nor do I think his 'fellow-Liberals' were in any doubt about his position; at any rate, of those known to me, none any longer regarded him as an active protagonist for a larger theological liberty or, on the other hand, supposed that he had or would ever become a pillar or even tolerant of obscurantism.

Even so, it was only after some misgiving that he decided to take a prominent part against the action of the Bishop and Dean of Liverpool:

> 'The nature of the issue raised' (by Lord Hugh Cecil's proposed action) 'can hardly fail to involve a disastrous conclusion, for the *success* of Cecil's action would mean the triumph of obscurantism, and its *failure* could not but imply the triumph of Erastian rationalism' (p. 312). 'The more I think over it, the more mischievous that action appears' (p. 313).

In the result, Dr. Henson took a leading part in procedure, in Convocation and outside, which issued in satisfaction to Lord Hugh. He did this with scrupulous fairness, as the Unitarians freely acknowledged. From the standpoint of what he calls 'the central and dominating issue of ecclesiastical procedure' his action and words were entirely logical and unexceptionable.[3]

This, however, does not preclude the question whether another angle of vision and consequent line of approach would not have been better. Dr. Jacks is an outstanding thinker, writer and teacher. He was willing and glad to join in an informal service of worship and edification in an Anglican cathedral. He had not formally *denied* the Church's doctrine of Christ, nor had he formally affirmed it. Can a comprehensive National Church like the Church of England for ever continue to maintain that a man of Dr. Jacks' character and calibre may not on occasion usefully address a congregation in an Anglican place of worship on many aspects of religious belief and Christian life, to 'the edifying of the body of Christ,'[4] when a man of the limited experience of a curate and the theological competence of the G.O.E. may do so, if he will accept and make it his business to preach certain doctrines, with meagre understanding of their nature and significance, and with little or no appreciation of the difficulties they involve for most thoughtful and many simple people? My own belief is that the Church of England will

[3] There were aspects of the controversy which, at the time, I did not know but afterwards became aware of. No good purpose would now be served by revealing these, and I have neither the wish nor the right to do so. If Dr. Henson had known of them, I think certain of his comments on individuals concerned would not have been quite what they are.

[4] No one would ask Dr. Jacks to preach a sermon in an Anglican church on the doctrine of Christ's person, nor would he be capable of discourteously abusing an invitation in that way. A theologian and eminent ecclesiastic detected formal heresy in one of the sermons he preached in Liverpool Cathedral—a use of the neuter pronoun in a reference to the Holy Spirit!

never again be the Church of the People of England if *this* kind of discrimination is to be maintained, without any discretion permitted to individual bishops on suitable occasions to relax it.

I do not think this volume will mitigate the perplexity which many feel about Dr. Henson's emergence as a champion of Disestablishment. He does not appear to me fully to appreciate the grounds of that perplexity. They have little to do with the fact that the Bishop changed his mind. He quotes his speech in the House of Lords on the occasion of the Prayer-book debate, in which with characteristic frankness he declared his view that the rejection of the book would result in a position 'which no self-respecting Church could rightly endure.' He continues:

> 'Could language be plainer? Why then am I accused of inconsistency because, the rejection having been accomplished, I say that Disestablishment is necessary in the interests of the Church's self-respect?'

The answer, of course, is that no sensible person does accuse him of inconsistency on that ground. The real difficulty finds concise expression in a letter addressed to him by Archbishop Lord Davidson when he read reports of Dr. Henson's second Quadrennial Charge:

> 'I shall want you some day ere long to explain to me in conversation how your present view fits in with what you said with masterly force just twenty years ago. I don't say the two utterances cannot be reconciled, but to me the reconciliation is not obvious.'

And the Archbishop was no mean practitioner in the art of reconciling and compromising apparently contradictory positions! Now Dr. Henson can most justly claim that his 'championship of the Establishment, though enthusiastic, persistent and sincere, has never been unconditioned,' and that he had ever perceived the anomalous character it had come to possess. *This is precisely where the difficulty lies.* When the reviewer as a young man first considered this question carefully, Dr. Henson's writings (all of which he claims to have read) exercised a great influence just because they were not nakedly Erastian but appeared to state so soundly and clearly so many aspects of the difficult problem, and at the same time to maintain his position enthusiastically. In replying to the Archbishop's letter quoted above, Dr. Henson mentions 'five new factors' which had transformed the whole question. It is true that he was opposed to the Enabling Act, though as a bishop he worked it loyally; but the grounds of his opposition most certainly did not include the retention of the veto of Parliament upon any kind of ecclesiastical legislation. The other four 'new factors' were not new, but had been more or less operative throughout the years of his championship of the Establishment.

He saw and records with devastating insight what the Commons' debate revealed. There was no conception of the Church as a spiritual society; but also:

> '1. *The extreme unpopularity of the Anglo-Catholic version of Anglicanism.* Nobody on either side was moved to say a word in its favour. The only point was whether the new Prayer Book did, or did not, provide an effective instrument for restraining it.
>
> '2. *The strength of the 'No Popery' frenzy.* Neither the education of the people, nor the prevalence of secularism, has destroyed this sentiment. It is still a force to be reckoned with in the political world.
>
> '3. *The unpopularity of the Bishops.* No credit was given to Episcopal assurances. No deference was shown to Episcopal authority. No consideration was disclosed for Episcopal feelings. The Bench of Bishops was treated with open contempt.'

But was all this entirely without just cause? There seems to have been a singular and inexplicable failure of Dr. Henson's penetrating insight in the supposition that Parliamentary approval of the revised Prayer-book would have made the least difference to the chaos of liturgical indiscipline. The serious offenders were strongly opposed to the book; the biographer of their leader in the House of Clergy claims that his hero was mainly responsible for the rejection. The book was only a permissive alternative, and in no sense obligatory. Its approval by Parliament would have made no difference whatever to the grounds on which Anglo-Catholics attempt to justify their teaching and practice in public worship. Moreover Dr. Henson was conscious that no restoration of order was possible without a final appeal to sanctions or to force. He was equally aware that the general temper of society would not tolerate imprisonment for conscientious religious scruples and that the existing law provides no other remedy. Why then did he not insist that the revised Prayer-book should be accompanied by a Measure providing, in the last resort, for the deprivation of the persistently lawless? If the bishops and the Church could not agree on such a Measure, what conceivable hope was there that their Lordships as a body would be moved to impose, or succeed in imposing, an obedience which for so long they had notoriously failed to secure?

The difficulty in reconciling Dr. Henson's change of front about the Establishment is that of seeing any factor in Parliament's rejection of the Prayer-book which was not implied and explicity recognized by him throughout the years of his advocacy of the Establishment. It was a factor voluntarily accepted in the Enabling Act, which the Church, not Parliament, had sought less than ten years earlier (when the larger freedom soon to be granted to the Church of Scotland was not asked for), a Parliamentary right which he had so persuasively argued to be both historically justified and also good alike for the nation and for the Church. After the Enabling Act he had himself appealed to this right of Parliament, unsuccessfully in the division of the diocese of Winchester in 1924, and triumphantly against the proposed division of Hereford in 1926 (than which 'few incidents in my career have given me more satisfaction'), notwithstanding that both proposals had been fully approved by the Church.

I cannot resist the impression that a potent factor in the Bishop's totally different reaction to the rejection of the Prayer-book Measure was his feeling that thereby the Church 'had been subjected to such extreme humiliation,' and one in which he was personally involved, having taken so large a part in the revision and the support of it. One cannot but wonder, though the question admits of no certain answer, even by himself, whether Dr. Henson would have come to champion Disestablishment if he had been a conscientious opponent of the revision proposals.

As a young man Dr. Henson was something of a High Churchman, or was so regarded, but he has always perceived the true significance of Anglo-Catholicism in relation to the reformed Church of England, and the implication of insistence upon episcopacy in the form of a doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Thus:

> 'The rapid advance of that party was threatening the historic character of the Church of England as a Reformed Church, and (that) the version of Christianity set forth in the parishes, which lay within the control of Anglo-Catholic incumbents, was definitely other than that which the standards and traditions of the Established Church had since the Reformation apparently and confessedly expressed . . . . The highest national interest was bound up with a loyal profession of that version of Christianity which was legally and traditionally expressed in "the Protestant Religion"' (p. 149*f*.).

Again, reflecting upon the discussions in the 1920 Lambeth Conference:

> 'Episcopacy is exalted far beyond what either its history or its actual influence justifies. It is not perceived that this lofty claim for episcopacy cannot, and in fact does not, stand alone. The type of Christianity of which the fact and doctrine of exclusive episcopacy form an integral factor, is not really possible for modernly educated Christians. The choice for them lies between Rome and some form of Protestantism, *i.e.* between authority and private judgment' (p. 23).

Once more:

> 'I was startled and alarmed by the apparent recrudescence within the National Church of beliefs, devotions, procedures, and ideals which in England had long been officially rejected, or had become practically obsolete, and which taken together tended to approximate the temper and aspect of English Christianity to the older and more imposing system of the Papal Communion. As I review my life, I cannot doubt that it has witnessed a change in Anglican Religion so great as to be almost a revolution. If this change had synchronized with a strengthening of the Church's influence in the popular life, I could hardly have avoided self-conviction of calamitous and blinding error. But there is unanimity in the opinion that organized Christianity is not growing stronger in the nation as the Established Church magnifies its claims and multiplies its activities' (p. 81).

And finally, commenting on the 1930 Lambeth Conference:

> 'Carnegie Simpson took strong ground when he challenged the sub-Committee to tell him what there was that we could add to the ministry which he already possessed. For our episcopal orders are as decisively, nay, far more decisively, rejected by the Church of Rome than are his Presbyterian orders by the Church of England. The most that can be said for Anglican episcopacy is that it is a real ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church, and that is what we are not prepared to deny to the Presbyterian polity. Indeed, it is difficult to rebut the contention that non-Roman episcopacy introduces its adherents to a smaller section of the Christian family than Presbyterianism' (p. 269).

There was an occasion when not a few expected that Dr. Henson would be again translated, this time to York; and he, quite naturally, allowed himself to entertain the possibility. He writes of it sincerely and with engaging frankness. There is a very attractive humanity and commonsense in the following:

> 'I think that I desire the distinction of *refusing* a Primacy, and, perhaps, I resent the loss of consequence which my being passed over must needs involve. The first is mere vanity: the last is probably slight and transitory. It is humiliating that the unreal and unwarranted chatter of newspapers and "Society" should be able to affect one's mind. And when I turn my thoughts in another direction, and consider, not my possible "*preferment*," but my certain *duty*, how disgusting this concern about the one shows against my unconcern for the other' (p. 210).

The unconcern was apparent to no one but himself. Taking it all in all, and notwithstanding the unfortunate conversion to Disestablishment, the present writer is numbered among those who think the credit of the Church of England would stand higher than it does to-day (at least among those described as 'that multitude of devout and thoughtful English Christians who were fully persuaded that the highest national interest was bound up with a loyal profession of . . . "the Protestant Religion"') if Dr. Henson had been translated, not indeed to York, but to Canterbury.

J. S. Bezzant.

DR. JULIAN HUXLEY'S LATEST BOOK*

The present volume originated in a presidential address on 'Natural Selection and Evolutionary Progress' delivered before the Zoology Section of the British Association. The modern conception of *natural selection* and its mode of operation is, Dr. Huxley tells us, different from that of Darwin's day, and much of the research on which the new outlook is based is so recent that the new ideas have not spread far. But the idea of *evolutionary progress,* which is complementary to it, has been 'undeservedly neglected.' The object of the present book is 'to attempt to give a broad account of the two concepts and their relation to each other.'

Natural selection is a biological theory of the origin of species; the idea of progress, on the other hand, whether evolutionary or otherwise, is a concept into which considerations of value enter, and which therefore seems philosophical in its nature rather than strictly scientific. Nevertheless, men of science, and Dr. Huxley among them, have claimed to deal with it on the strictly scientific level.

A great part of the present volume is taken up with an account of recent researches, which makes it an important book of reference for students. The assemblage of facts is remarkable. Only an expert could pronounce adequately upon this side of Dr. Huxley's book, and we do not propose to do so here.

But with regard to the idea of evolutionary progress, Dr. Huxley holds that by introducing certain objective criteria into the definition of progress it is possible, at least in the case of pre-human evolution, to keep the idea on the strictly scientific level. In regard to human evolution, however, he admits that 'the nettle must be grasped and human values given a place among the criteria of human progress.'

The correct method of approaching this problem of progress, if it is to be kept on the scientific level, is the inductive one.

> 'The unprejudiced observer will accordingly begin by examining various types of "so-called higher" organisms and trying to discover what characters they possess in common by which they differ from "lower" organisms. He will then proceed to examine the course of evolution as recorded in fossils and deduced from indirect evidence, to see what the main types of evolutionary change have been; whether some of them have consistently led to the development of characters diagnostic of "higher" forms; which types of change have been most successful in producing new groups, dominant forms, and so forth. If evolutionary progress exists, he will by this means discover its factual basis, and this will enable him to give an objective definition.'

Proceeding on these lines, Dr. Huxley observes that perhaps the most salient fact in the evolutionary history of life is the succession of what palaeontologists call 'dominant' types. These are characterized not only by a high degree of complexity, but by a capacity for branching out into a multiplicity of forms. Later dominant groups normally arise from an unspecialized line of an earlier dominant group, as the birds and reptiles from the early reptiles, and man from the *Primates* among the mammals.

> 'They represent, in fact, one among many lines of adaptive radiation; but they differ from the others in containing the potentiality of evolving so as to become dominant on a new level, with the aid of new properties. Usually the new dominance is marked by a fresh outburst of radiation: the only exception to this rule is Man, a dominant type which shows negligible radiation of the usual structurally adapted sort, but makes up for its absence by the complexity of his social life and his division of labour.'

If the characters which distinguish dominant from non-dominant and earlier from later dominant groups are examined, they are found to include efficiency

* *Evolution, the Modern Synthesis,* by Julian Huxley, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (Allen & Unwin. 25/-. 1943.)

n such matters as speed and the application of force to overcome physical imitations; also the capacity for keeping the internal environment constant, especially its temperature, making the organism independent of a wide range of external temperature change. Thus the distinguishing characteristics of dominant groups all fall into one or other of two types — those making for greater control over the environment, and those making for greater independence of changes in the environment. In Dr. Huxley's view advance in these respects 'may provisionally be taken as the criterion of biological progress.' This seems reasonable, and puts the idea of biological progress on an objective basis.

Dr. Huxley points out that progress, thus understood, is not the same thing as specialization. Whereas specialization is an improvement in efficiency of adaptation *for a particular mode of life,* progress is an improvement in efficiency *of living in general.* The latter is an all-round, the former a one-sided, advance. Dr. Huxley makes the interesting point that

> 'there is no certain case on record of a line showing a high degree of specialization giving rise to a new type. All new types which themselves are capable of adaptive radiation seem to have been produced by relatively unspecialized ancestral lines.'

Granted, then, that the idea of progress is a legitimate one, and not merely an anthropomorphism, it would appear that only along one single line — the line of *Homo sapiens* — can it be further continued. For one of the concomitants of organic progress has been the progressive cutting down of the possible modes of further progress.

But with the coming of Man the problem of values has to be faced, for he differs from all previous dominant types in that he can consciously formulate values. Thus the realization of these values must be added to the criteria of biological progress, once advance has reached the human level. And true human progress consists in 'increases of aesthetic, intellectual, and spiritual experience and satisfaction.' Control over and independence of external environment now become mere subsidiary mechanisms serving as the material basis for the human type of progress.

> 'The really significant control and independence apply to man's mental states — his control of ideas to give intellectual satisfaction, of form and colour or of sound to give aesthetic satisfaction, his independence of inessential stimuli and ideas to give the satisfaction of mystic detachment and inner ecstasy.'

Although Dr. Huxley regards the idea of *progress,* both on the biological and human levels, as legitimate, he does not attach the same validity to the idea of *purpose* in connection with evolution.

> 'The ordinary man, or at least the ordinary poet, philosopher, and theologian, is always asking himself what is the purpose of human life, and is anxious to discover some extraneous purpose to which he and humanity may conform. Some find such a purpose exhibited directly in revealed religion; others think they can uncover it from the facts of nature. One of the commonest methods of this form of natural religion is to point to evolution as manifesting such a purpose . . .
>
> 'I believe this reasoning to be wholly false. The purpose manifested in evolution, whether in adaptation, specialization, or biological progress, is only an apparent purpose. It is as much the product of blind forces as is the falling of a stone to earth or the ebb and flow of the tides. It is we who have read purpose into evolution, as earlier men projected will and emotion into inorganic phenomena like storm or earthquake. If we wish to work towards a purpose for the future of man, we must formulate that purpose ourselves. Purposes in life are made, not found.'

But if a *purpose* cannot be discovered in evolution, a *direction* can be discerned — the line of evolutionary progress, which past direction can serve as a

guide in formulating our purpose for the future.

> 'Increase of control, increase of independence, increase of internal co-ordination; increase of knowledge, of means for co-ordinating knowledge, of elaborateness and intensity of feeling — those are trends of the most general order. If we do not continue them in the future, we cannot hope that we are in the main line of evolutionary progress.'

An important point to note is that each major step in progress has necessitated the scrapping of some of the achievements of earlier advances. Thus the precise formulation of human purpose cannot be wholly decided on the basis of the past. Each step in evolutionary progress brings new problems which must be solved on their own merits.

Obviously the formulation of an agreed purpose for man as a whole will not be easy. To-day two opposed ideals confront one another — that of the subordination of the individual to the community, and that of his intrinsic superiority.

> 'Another struggle still in progress is between the idea of a purpose directed to a future life in a supernatural world, and one directed to progress in this existing world.'

Until such major conflicts are resolved, humanity can have no single major purpose, and progress can be but fitful and slow. Before it can be rapid, man 'must not continue to put off the responsibilities which are really his on to the shoulders of mythical gods or metaphysical absolutes.'

Dr. Huxley does not join in the general retreat of the intellectuals, but professes a belief in progress:

> 'Let us not forget that it is possible for progress to be achieved. After the disillusionment of the early twentieth century it has become as fashionable to deny the existence of progress and to brand the idea of it as a human illusion, as it was fashionable in the optimism of the nineteenth century to proclaim not only its existence but its inevitability. The truth is between the two extremes. Progress is a major fact of past evolution; but it is limited to a few selected stocks. It may continue in the future, but it is not inevitable; man, by now become the trustee of evolution, must work and plan if he is to achieve progress for himself and so for life.
>
> 'This limited and contingent progress is very different from the *deus ex machina* of nineteenth-century thought, and our optimism may well be tempered by reflection on the difficulties to be overcome. None the less, the demonstration of the existence of a general trend which can legitimately be called progress, and the definition of its limitations, will remain as a fundamental contribution of evolutionary biology to human thought.'

One wonders how far the title of Dr. Huxley's book, 'Evolution: *The* Modern Synthesis,' is entirely justified. Perhaps the more modest phrase, '*A* Modern Synthesis,' would have been more appropriate. Even if the claim of scientists to give a meaning to existence be allowed, their interpretations can hardly be ultimate, inasmuch as science, so long as it remains science, must leave certain questions unanswered (and is not the question of *purpose* one of these?). Yet it would be strange if men of science did not attempt to provide us with a comprehensive scheme of thought, since the public expects it of them. Those who have provided us with so much can surely be relied on to provide us with the something more that we so sorely need, namely some secure faith about the meaning and value of life! Such, at any rate, is the argument. In his recent and widely read Penguin Special, *The Scientific Attitude*, Dr. C. H. Waddington clearly states the claim of the man of science to supply a meaning to existence and a criterion of moral values, at least to a reasonable degree:

> 'Science derives its idea of what is a valuable result from its knowledge of the nature and behaviour of things. This sounds an extravagant claim; philosophers have been looking for a definition of value for cen-

turies without finding one. But the scientist's idea of value is much more relative and restricted than the philosopher's. It does not pretend to be "the good" from any absolute and final point of view. It is merely the good from the point of view of what is going on here and now.'[1]

Yet it is difficult for a man of science to deny that science is in reality instrumental only. Science no doubt enables us to realise values here and now, or at least to give them a relative fulfilment. But any claim of science to *give* us our values would seem, perhaps, ill-grounded. No doubt in so far as science has been a mental discipline and enabled us to clear our minds of cant and superstition, it has made us better able to perceive values. But that is a rather different thing. And in any case it is easy to exaggerate the value of science as a *widely experienced* mental discipline, for it is only this for a tiny minority (an influential one, doubtless) of a modern population. To have a working acquaintance with the results of applied science, *i.e.* of technology, is common enough to-day; but the mental faculties are not thereby deeply stimulated, still less is an acute sense of values generated.

Whence come our values? Are they the product of human experience, in which case the scientist and the historian are competent to pronounce on the validity of those we profess, and even to supply us with fresh ones. Or, on the other hand, do they 'derive their validity from a reality beyond the reality of this space-time world'? If there be anything in the latter point of view, Dr. Huxley's work can hardly claim to be a satisfying and complete synthesis, though we may concede that the adjective 'modern' is appropriate enough.

J. C. Hardwick.

CHRIST'S STRANGE WORK*

The Rev. A. R. Vidler takes as title for the latest Bishop of London's Lent Book,* of which he is the author, a phrase culled from a German Reformation Confession of 1576, the *Formula of Concord*. The *Formula of Concord* distinguishes between two aspects of Christ's ministry. His 'proper office' was to declare the grace of God. There is however another aspect, His 'strange work.' It was to bring before men's eyes the terror of God's wrath. To evacuate Law from Gospel, Law in all its rigour, is a grievous error. Mr. Vidler deplores the fond imagination that the Sermon on the Mount is the fulfilment or essence of the Gospel. It is not. It is the fulfilment of the Law. It is a sentence of doom. 'If this is the demand for perfect holiness that God makes upon His people, then we are all doomed.' It is 'the culminating part of Christ's strange work.'

Mr. Vidler, following the *Formula of Concord,* distinguishes between three types of Law, each with its own function. The first type acts as a social cement, preserving society from collapse into anarchy. It is Political Law, in the Jewish system inseparable from the ceremonial and religious law, but now distinct. In that it subserves God's purpose for mankind it is divine. It is hard, severe, impersonal, and retributive. It is the Law of the State, and, as the State is ordained by God, State Law is so far God's Law. 'The power wielded by the political authorities is God's power.' In doing our duty to the State we are doing our duty to God. The realization that the State is subordinate to God should safeguard us from making an idol of the State; but, nevertheless,

> 'Christian sects, like the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation, which refused to bear arms, or to take oaths, and which were in fact anarchistic, were thereby heretical, *i.e.* in contradiction to the Word of God as testimony is borne to it in the Old and New Testaments.'

The second use of Law is paedogogic. The function of Paedogogic Law is not that of a schoolmaster or tutor, as the English Versions wrongly have it, but that of a warder. St. Paul in using this simile is contrasting the re-

[1] I owe this quotation to Dr. F. C. Happold's *Towards a New Aristocracy,* p. 31.

* *Christ's Strange Work,* by the Rev. A. R. Vidler. (Longmans, Green & Co. 2/6. 1944.)

pressive discipline appropriate to childhood with the liberty proper to manhood. Paedogogic Law shows us up as we are, and the more it is worked out in detail, the less does it leave us any standing ground. It differs from State Law in that it is more personal. It is essentially damnatory.

The function of the Law was to teach men that they were impotent to live in obedience to God, its message that men were under God's wrath. Christ, who alone fulfilled the Law, by so doing won freedom for them. Mr. Vidler does not express very clearly how this came about.

> 'To be a Christian,' he says, 'means to be born again into the Messiah which is the new Israel, God's redeemed poeple who have been delivered from the bondage of the Law and made sharers in the grace and reality that came in the Messiah.'

Such language is not conspicuous for lucidity. The activity of Christ is continued in the Church through its ministry of Word and Sacraments. But the new dispensation still has need of the Law, though its function has now changed. It is now Didactic Law, providing guidance and warning for the redeemed. Because this type of law is necessary, Mr. Vidler concludes that

> 'a living Church will always produce a pattern for the common life, a ceremonial or cultural pattern, adapted to each place and time.'

Underlying the whole of Mr. Vidler's discussion of Law and its function is a radical doctrine of the Fall. He treats the Fall of Man as a fundamental axiom. To hold this doctrine does not necessarily imply a literal acceptance of the story of Adam and Eve in Eden, for in an appended note Mr. Vidler gives three alternatives. The Fall may be regarded either as a pre-mundane or as a prehistoric event, or, yet again, it may be taken as a true mythology of human nature. But, surely, the modern revival of Origen's pre-mundane theory of the Fall has no importance beyond its psychological interest as a curious resurgence of the mythopoeic tendencies which were characteristic of our remote ancestors. Nor have we any evidence of the Fall as a specific event in the mist-enshrouded history of primitive man. The third and most refined variant seems singularly out of accord with the definitely concrete character of the *Genesis* story. Mr. Vidler gives his reader a choice between these three alternatives. The reader, who acknowledges an emergent consciousness of sinfulness in man, may well demur that the real business of the theologian is to interpret this in relation to the ascent, or, if Mr. Vidler prefers it, the descent of man from an ape-like ancestor. To this task folk-lore tales are in the main irrelevant. If Mr. Vidler were justified in attaching the supreme importance he does to the Fall as expressed mythologically or otherwise in *Genesis*, it is strange that this theory that human sinfulness is connected with Adam's disobedience in Eden should have left so little trace in the writings of the Old Testament.

Mr. Vidler holds that *Genesis* provides the key to the understanding of all history.

> 'Human history is meaningless and schemeless, if what the book of *Genesis* says is not true.' *Genesis* 'is a mythology that gives the key to the understanding of all history.'

He deplores the modern student's excessive concentration on the writings of the Hebrew prophets which, he remarks, unlike most of the Old Testament, can, by judicious selection, be squared with certain popular forms of social idealism. But it was under the influence of the prophets that the mass of folk-lore, tradition, and legend which make up the earlier part of the Old Testament was shaped, modified, and adapted for the edification of the common man. The prophetic writings are primary, the rest secondary. A distinguished Old Testament scholar, Professor S. A. Cook, is convinced that the stories of the patriarchs, the Exodus and the Invasion as a whole belong round about the sixth century, and therefore received their present form after the time of the great prophets.

Genesis, Mr. Vidler says, 'is rather like the prologue that is sometimes spoken before a play begins on the stage, before the curtain goes up.' He uses language which suggests that by the time of Moses the curtain has already gone up and that it reveals the stage of history. He admits that the great body of Jewish law 'cannot have been actually dictated to, and written down by Moses.' The Decalogue he regards as 'a forecast or a summary in advance of the developed legal system of Israel.' It is difficult to agree that the later elaborate ceremonial and ritual code can reasonably be regarded as a necessary or, in parts, even a legitimate development of the Decalogue; but, however that may be, apparently Mr. Vidler thinks that a crucial event took place at a definite time at a definite place. God promulgated the Decalogue through Moses at Sinai. This was a historical event. But Mr. Vilder is simplifying a complex position quite illegitimately. Old Testament scholars believe that developed Judaism owed much to indigenous Canaanite religion, and not least in the realm of Law. The Canaanites, for example, borrowed a code of law from Babylonia, its prototype being the Code of Hammurabi, and elements of this Canaanite law which was known at Shechem before the Hebrews entered the country under Joshua, survive in the Covenant Code of *Exodus*.

Scholars also speak of the dawn of conscience in Canaan and Egypt and its relationship to the Hebrew conscience. Mr. Vidler makes little or no reference to conscience. The Law was given to the Hebrews at Sinai from above and from outside.

> 'The very fact that a Law had to be promulgated *for* them and *to* them,' he writes, 'was evidence that the Law was not *in* them.,

But not even the thunders of Sinai could give the Decalogue or any other code of moral and spiritual laws any validity unless some response was elicited from the moral consciousness of the hearers. There is a necessary correlation between effective revelation and receptivity. The growth of the moral consciousness and revelation may properly be regarded as aspects of the same thing. It is the defect of much of the theology which has a present vogue that it lacks a criterion of moral and spiritual truth, and is even hazy about its standard of factual truth. Mr. Vidler shows no consciousness of the need of such a criterion. He even quotes with approval Brunner's saying,

> 'The Law is the gift of God. The Bible knows nothing about a general law of reason.'

As against this we certainly read in the Bible that 'the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord,' words which imply that within man, even though he be sinful, is to be found a light which provides a criterion of moral and spiritual truth. As to factual truth, a strong insistence on mythology as an adequate channel of divine revelation depresses its value and importance.

Jesus used a criterion for the acceptance or rejection of the Jewish Law, and expected His hearers to do the same. He used the criterion of moral and spiritual value to sweep away the distinction between clean and unclean foods. St. Mark is quite justified in saying, 'This He did, making all foods clean.' He applied the criterion of utility to the code of Sabbath observance when He said, 'The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.'

Mr. Vidler refers to the apparent conflict between St. Paul's justification by faith and St. James' justification by works; but he ignores the real conflict in the early Church between the Judaizing party and the liberalizing party, and he makes no allowance for the infection of St. Matthew's Gospel by traces of a writing which clearly came from a Judaizing source. It is obvious that Jesus, who constantly inveighed against the traditions of the elders, could not possibly have said, as reported in *Matthew*, 'The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe.' The presence of this alien material in *Matthew* should

have made Mr. Vidler more cautious in quoting from this Gospel passages referring to the Law.

Mr. Vidler's book is vigorous and contains material of value. His quotations from divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are refreshing; but much water has flowed under the bridge since their time, and their conceptions need more modification than Mr. Vidler would seem prepared to admit.

G. L. H. HARVEY.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL—AGAIN AND YET AGAIN *

The discussion on St. John's Gospel continues with unabated interest and undimmed zest. In recent years attention has been drawn in the pages of the *Modern Churchman* to numerous studies, critical and expository, which have sought to unravel its problems and to elucidate its message. Scholars and preachers; theologians with concern for Christian truth, and ecclesiastics with the care of the churches; heirs of the thought of the practical West, and heirs of the thought of the mystical East—all such have been turning again to the greatest book of religion ever written, as I have dared to call this Fourth Gospel.

The two additions to recent Johannine literature, which are before me, are scholarly discussions with the numerous references and citations belonging necessarily to such.

Dr. Howard's book supplements his previous book, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation.* The gratitude inspired by the former erudite, valuable and convenient discussion of critical issues will be increased by these eight lectures under the Dale Trust. Here the author's intention is a more positive elucidation of Johannine Christianity. The same exact scholarship and attention to detail which characterized the former is also manifest here, for the scholar, like the leopard, does not change his spots. The present volume is another illustration of the awakening of Christian students everywhere to the need for positive and constructive understanding and presentation of the real message of the New Testament books.

The title *Christianity according to St. John* will remind the reader of volumes with similar titles, such as *Christianity according to St. Paul,* etc. These titles are themselves significant: for they indicate a big step from the position, once generally held, that 'Christianity' was to every writer of the New Testament precisely and fundamentally the same body of doctrines; or that its final presentation in terms of a unified and comprehensive theology has come down to us from the past; and, therefore, that nothing remained for us moderns but to accept it and to transmit it. We now see, and are able to say frankly, that Paul was not John. Thus has the historical and psychological approach to the field of early Christian record revolutionised the conception of the Bible.

The student of the Fourth Gospel will be interested to note the strong support given by Dr. Howard to the view, gaining ground so markedly in recent years, that we have to look to a Hebraic heritage of thought, and not to a Hellenistic, for a true understanding of the Fourth Gospel. The theological and philosophical implications of the tendency are, it will be obvious, of very great importance: in my own judgment they call for a reconsideration and restatement of the dogmatic history and conclusions of the first five centuries. Such issues do not, of course, come within the purview of this volume, for the author is concerned primarily with understanding the Fourth Gospel in its original setting: but they belong, I am confident, to the theologian of the future. For had the Hebraic heritage been more dominant in the first five centuries 'Christianity' would have come down to us differently—in its theological as well as in its institutional and practical expressions.

* *Christianity according to St. John,* by Dr. W. F. Howard. (Duckworth. 6/-. 1943.)
The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church, by J. N. Sanders. (Cambridge University Press. 7/6. 1943.)

Dr. Howard discusses judiciously, with scholarly balance and with pedagogic discretion such themes as 'Salvation,' 'Eschatology' and 'Mysticism,' 'Church, Ministry and Sacraments,' 'Faith, Knowledge and Love.' His mind in each case seeks to rise above 'false antitheses,' and to discover the middle way. This is noteworthy in his chapter on 'Eschatology and Mysticism,' where, as he says in his preface, he recognizes more fully than in his former book the bearing of the Hebraic approach to the Fourth Gospel on the elucidation of an important issue. Here he seeks to achieve 'a living unity' of 'mysticism' and 'eschatology,' both of which he sees in this Gospel. In an interesting Appendix Note he illustrates from the hymns of Charles Wesley to show how the language of mysticism and of 'undiluted Jewish apocalyptic' can both be used by a single writer. The reminder is valuable. Yet the final question is the precise and essential nature of the irreconciliation within the mind of the Johannine Evangelist. I am interested to read Dr. Howard's criticism of Dr. C. H. Dodd on this issue. 'Professor Dodd is right in saying that "in the Fourth Gospel the crudely eschatological elements in the *kerugma* are refined away . . . The evangelist is deliberately subordinating the *futurist* element in the eschatology of the early Church to the *realised eschatology* which was from the first the distinctive and controlling factor in the *kerugma*." He is treading on more uncertain ground when he goes on to say: "The fact is that in this Gospel, even more fully than in Paul, eschatology is sublimated into a distinctive kind of mysticism. Its underlying philosophy, like that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is of a Platonic cast, which is always congenial to the mystical outlook. The ultimate reality, instead of being, as in Jewish apocalyptic, figured as the last item in the historical series, is conceived as an eternal order of being, of which the phenomenal order in history is the shadow or symbol." I gravely question whether, in spite of many points of contact with the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Fourth Evangelist fully shares this Platonic view of the world.' The underlying problem, as Dr. Howard sees, is 'that of the relation of time and eternity.' 'The Hebraic approach seems to involve three positions: (*a*) the time-process is a reality, (*b*) closely related to "eternity," (*c*) which includes it rather than extends it, still less "shadows" it.'

Mr. Sanders' book is by a younger man, as I gather from the fact that it is the Kaye Essay Prize for 1939 in the University of Cambridge. It is a careful and detailed study of the influence of the Fourth Gospel on the life of the early Church and, particularly, on Christian theology up to Irenaeus.

After a brief introduction Mr. Sanders gives two very useful chapters of detailed exploration of early Christian literature: one on the Fourth Gospel in the literature up to Theophilus of Antioch, the second on the use made of the Fourth Gospel by the Alexandrian Gnostics and by Irenaeus. A brief conclusion, emphasising the hypothesis of an Alexandrian origin of the Gospel, and that it was written with a 'Proto-Gnostic theosophy' in view, suggests that Mr. Sanders is pursuing his studies in order to show the influence of the Fourth Evangelist on the great Alexandrians, Clement, Origen and Athanasius. Dare I suggest to the student of this important field the appositeness of a remark once made about an Oxford Greats scholar, 'He knows everything *about* Plato. But what about *Plato*?'

Mr. Sanders is working on fruitful lines, and if he can make the Fourth Evangelist, Clement, Origen and Athanasius really live, by really *seeing* them with the eyes of the imaginative mind, he will be working to much profit for the future of Christian thought.

Deo gratias! When the Discussions, the Elucidations and the Commentaries have all been written, St. John's Gospel remains.

Yet our thanks are also due to every sincere and reverent student who can help people to-day to see and to understand.

C. J. WRIGHT.

DIALOGUES ON CHRISTIAN TEACHING*

The world is full of obstinate questionings, and Dr. Cadoux, constituting himself into a sort of religious Brains Trust, sets out to deal with some of them in this series of Dialogues on Christian Teaching entitled *A Pilgrim's Further Progress*. For the many who find the sustained argument of a long chapter difficult, the method of question and answer between Pilgrim and Interpreter has obvious advantages. Others, however, will say that it is apt to interrupt the flow of thought, like the click of a slide at a lantern-lecture, and to spoil the writing with colloquialisms which sometimes jar. Like all Dr. Cadoux's work, this book happily combines lucidity with learning, and the reader is left in little doubt as to the meaning of what he is asked to accept or reject.

The book is divided into nine chapters. The first four deal with questions concerning the existence and character of God, the nature and conditions of Christian Doctrine, the Person and Work of Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Doctrine of the Trinity. The fifth chapter lays down the general principles of Christian living, which leads naturally to a discussion on 'prayer' and 'the Church.' Two chapters on 'sex' and 'our world and the future' conclude the book. The approach throughout is that of liberal protestantism:

> 'On a long view, the safest path of theological progress is a bold and trustful use of reason and intelligence, combined with reverence for the great central sanctities, human and Divine; . . . the possibility of error has to be faced, *whatever* theological path we tread. And to seek the correction of it in an open-minded re-examination of our thought-processes, and in repeated efforts to reach coherence in our conclusions, is a far safer policy than to seek it (as so many prefer to do) by taking our stand on some body of objective declarations, arbitrarily assumed to be necessarily immune from error' (p. ix).

A distinction which is of cardinal importance in Dr. Cadoux's thinking is that between the foundation-realities of religion and the doctrinal conceptions based on them and designed to describe and clarify them. Examples of the first are the existence and perfection of God and the authority of His will, the power of prayer and the Saviourhood of Jesus; examples of the second are the pre-existence of Christ, the Triune nature of God, the Atonement as usually understood, the inerrancy of the Bible.

These latter doctrinal propositions are human constructions largely affected by the subjective conditions of the theologian's mind, and as such have a relative and non-final quality inherent in all formulated doctrine:

> 'The process of putting a belief into a formal creed introduces no new principle, and does not necessarily confer on that belief any greater authority than is possessed by other unanimously-held beliefs. It displays if anything an inferior grade of authority—for what was put into creeds was usually some controversial conclusion which was *not* accepted by all Christians, however those who did accept it might arrogate to themselves the sole right to be regarded as the true Church. A frequent modern form of the same unwarranted claim—*the tacit assumption* of the point in dispute—is to call the view which one prefers an item of "the Christian faith" or of "what Christians believe," or "what the Christian means" when he says this or that' (p. 40).

Thus Dr. Cadoux goes on to show that the Christ portrayed in the Creeds as understood by those who compiled, defended, and explained them, presents several features which are incongruous with the truth of history; that *religiously the New Testament is a unity, but theologically it is not*; that in connexion with the doctrine of the Trinity, rather than with that of the

**A Pilgrim's Further Progress*, by C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., D.Litt. (Basil Blackwell. 1943. 213 pp. 10/6.)

Person of Christ taken by itself, the Fathers wisely admitted their incompetence, yet unwisely legislated and persecuted as if they were competent; that in the use of the Bible

> 'the difference between the Fundamentalist and the Critic is not that the Critic picks and chooses, while the Fundamentalist humbly accepts the whole, but that the Critic picks-and-chooses with his eyes open and on a deliberate and rational plan, while the Fundamentalist picks-and-chooses without recognizing that he is doing so, and on no thought out principle' p. 13);

that 'the redemptive power of the death of Jesus as a revelation of how God's love reacts to human sin lies in the impression it makes on the inmost heart of the sinner by its moral nobility and grandeur: it is therefore only what one ought to expect, that *all* self-sacrificing acts of moral grandeur and nobility should bring something of the same kind of pressure to bear on sinners' (p. 66).

Barthianism is rightly criticized and rejected as teaching the complete otherness of God as over and against man, the non-existence of any way from man to God, the futility of Natural Theology, the damnability of Liberal Modernism, and its contemptuous disregard for the quest of the historical Jesus. 'It is a pity,' writes Dr. Cadoux, 'that men of this school allow themselves to be so truculent in their references to those who do not agree with them.' His examples of this lack of manners are delicious; I particularly liked the one which depicts Modernism as a spineless slug leaving a slimy trail as it crawls, wobbling and uncertain. Even a slug may turn.

As a distinguished student of the New Testament and Church History, Dr. Cadoux moves with firm step among the subjects dealt with in the first three-quarters of his excellent book. On the questions raised by the many-sided subject of 'sex' and 'our world and the future' he is, I think, less authoritative. He himself confesses that concerning sex he writes only as 'a family man who has tried to keep his eyes, ears, and mind open.' More than that is needed if he is to escape the subjective conditions of his own mind, the danger of which he has already pointed out in another connexion. It might even be contended that the sex experiments of recent years are a clear proof that ours is a profoundly moral age when compared with the picture given in E. Wingfield-Stratford's *The Victorian Tragedy*. The customary or assumed is not necessarily the true or the wise, and those who seek to-day for a more moral solution for problems hitherto covered up are neither flippant nor mindless. Many of them simply regard the established view that all is right within marriage and all wrong outside it as shockingly immoral. It was Milton the Puritan who urged that without the 'deep and serious verity' of mutual love, wedlock is 'nothing but the empty husks of a mere outside matrimony,' a mere hypocrisy, and must be dissolved; it is 'a covenant, the very being whereof consisted not in forced cohabitation and counterfeit performance of duties, but in unfeigned love and peace.' What is needed is a new Puritanism, more enlightened yet as sincere as that of Milton, for it is not enough to say that if men and women were truly Christian difficulties would not arise, or that if they do they must be borne by the grace of God. To love we must add knowledge and a kindly tolerance which realizes that the oscillations from the norm of so-called monogamy are conditioned by physiological and psychological factors which cannot be ignored. Havelock Ellis's *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* is worth careful study by those who desire to form clear judgments in an admittedly difficult realm.

In the last chapter Dr. Cadoux once more states the pacifist case against war, since the Christian must on no occasion, he claims, return evil for evil, but always 'overcome evil with good.' His account of events since 1918 will not win assent from any of his readers. Nor does he deal with the problem of Germany, so vividly described by Herbert Agar in *A Time for Greatness*:

'Sentimental and brutal, romantic and efficient, Germany has always been a perplexing combination of suburban businessman and blood-hungry savage.' In perfect good temper, but to our surprise, Dr. Cadoux concludes by asking concerning the pacifist and the soldier, 'May not both of them be right, relatively to their own respective insight (and consequent vocation), and yet without denying the existence of an absolute or ideal standard at which both of them are equally aiming, though with different powers of vision? Differing degrees of equally honest insight would thus justify differing modes of action for different people' (p. 197). The dictum is capable of wide and fruitful application in many fields.

It is a happy note on which to close a book full of good things which urges its readers to think for themselves, remembering that 'the only absolute authority is truth itself.' There is hope of progress in this quest so long as Pilgrim and Interpreter keep company. T. WIGLEY.

ROME'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR JUVENILE CRIME*

At a time when the Roman Church is making an appeal both subtle and sentimental for the preferential treatment of her day schools, this little pamphlet most opportunely appears as a counterblast. The author is an Alderman of the Liverpool City Council, a member of the Education Committee, and was for a quarter of a century a Guardian of the Poor. The facts and figures he gives are taken from the municipal department's publications, and the only reasonable conclusion which can be drawn from the information thus supplied is that preferential treatment for Roman Catholic day schools means, in practice, the encouragement of juvenile crime!

Thus some of the figures for children and young people under 17 years found guilty of indictable offences for the year 1937 were Birmingham 989, Manchester 873, Liverpool 1,746. Eighty-two per cent. were from Roman Catholic Schools, 12 per cent. from Church of England Schools, and only 6 per cent. from Council Schools. In England generally the blackest spots for juvenile crime are industrial towns with large Irish Roman Catholic populations. In Scotland the same high juvenile criminality figures obtain, and again the plague-spots are the same.

Those who affect to admire all things Roman have to explain why in every land where the Roman Church has held supreme sway the mass of the people have been reduced to poverty whilst the Roman Church herself is the wealthiest corporation in the world. This is a pamphlet well worth study.

F.I.L.R.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

SIR, THE EDUCATION BILL: A LESSON FROM INDIA

I was glad to read in your 'Signs of the Times' (of which the vision and courage are a quarterly refreshment) a reminder, in connection with the new Education Bill, that there are also the home and the clergy besides the state schools. In the elementary schools I suppose the time spent by the children for all purposes would average three hours a day, or less, spread over the whole year, but the objections made on behalf of denominational teaching would seem reasonable only if the whole of the religious instruction were entrusted to these schools. As this is not so, there seems a lack of confidence in the denominational background, or a note of defeatism in the representations made by 'Catholics,' Roman and Anglican.

* *Rome's Responsibility for Juvenile Crime*, by Alderman the Rev. H. D. Longbottom, F.R.Econ.S. (Protestant Truth Society. 6*d*.)

During my limited experience of eleven or twelve years in the I.C.S. I perceived, I thought, quite clearly the impossibility of the Government's taking sides or showing favours where different religions exist side by side. The same surely applies, *mutatis mutandis* and *pro tanto,* even here. So soon as denominations cease to maintain schools for their own children, and members of other denominations share the same school area, it becomes not only unjust but definitely not practical politics for the government concerned to have anything but an agreed syllabus.

D. G. Davies.

The Rectory, Bletchington.
February 25th, 1944.

Sir, THE COUNTRY PARSON AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The discussion on the Education Bill must surely have added to our great respect for the Mother of Parliaments. I have followed the speeches reported in Hansard with admiration because of their grasp of intricate details and their eloquence. It is rash to single out any speakers in a prolonged debate of such consistently high level, and yet I will mention Moelwyn Hughes, Ivor Thomas, Professor Gruffydd, Kenneth Lindsay, Alfred Beit, Arthur Greenwood, R. D. Denman and A. G. Walkden as speakers to whom the future of education will owe much under the truly magnificent work and guidance of R. A. Butler and J. Shuter Ede.

I wonder if I speak for many of the rural clergy of the Church of England when I assert that the Agreed Syllabuses and the Acts of Worship which accompany them are ample for inculcating and nourishing the Christian life and faith in the Primary Schools. Let the Churches which think more is required than what is laid down in Article IV teach that on Sundays.

I suggest that 'inter-denominational' is a far better, more accurate description of the Agreed Syllabus than 'un-denominational.' Moreover, these syllabuses furnish a natural means of approach to the closer and more effective union of those who profess themselves Christians. The attitude of the Roman Catholics is intolerable—'A people that say, "Stand by thyself; come not near to me, for I am holier than thou."'

In many rural parishes where the single school is Church of England there has never been any trouble with Nonconformists except when some fanatical or politically-minded minister has created an artificial disturbance. The reason, of course, is that the teaching was really all the time on the lines of the now well-known Agreed Syllabuses. This was because most of the rural clergy were—dare I say it?—gentlemen and did not wish to take a mean, unsporting advantage of their position, and also because the tradition of the country clergy is to think of and treat *all* their parishioners—Jew, Turk, infidel, heretic or Nonconformist—as friends to whom they ought to be servants. So Agreed Syllabuses are not so strange a phenomenon, after all!

May I give a recent example of how it works? Out of some eighty-five boys in the C.E. School here, only some ten belong to Church families; yet they all came to church on Ash Wednesday morning. We had Parts II and I, in that order, from the 'Daily Service' used by the Council Schools in Kesteven and Derbyshire, together with hymns, lesson and address. Moreover, some six or seven girls from the Council School were allowed to attend. There would have been a few more, but the Director of Education insists quite rightly on the parents writing a request for their children to come to church; and we all know how parents hate writing. Personally I would dearly love to have had with me ministers and local preachers of the Wesleyans, Methodists and particular Baptists at the service. How lovely is 'inclusive' Christianity; how poisonous is it when 'exclusive'!

Billinghay Vicarage, Lincoln. W. Stanhope-Lovell.
March 4th, 1944.

A MODERN DECLARATION OF CHRISTIAN FAITH BY THREE EDUCATIONISTS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

SIR,

Seekers after truth, religious educators and ordinary plain men are constantly disturbed by the conflicting claims made by the different Christian denominations that this, that or the other affirmation — about doctrine, or authority, or history, or miracle, or ritual — is essential if one is 'to be a Christian.' Whilst everyone recognises that it is inevitable — and healthily inevitable — that there should be real disagreements on all the topics enumerated, it is important to try to discover, and to put into plain untechnical English, an agreed common essence from which the variety of opinions may spring and upon the basis of which co-operation is possible, and to distinguish the essential from the rest. This common essence should be *definitely* Christian, and not vaguely humanitarian; it should insist on every part of its affirmation as necessary, but it should as far as possible avoid formulations which, *qua* formulations, are controversial as between believing Christians, and which, if pressed, would exclude some of these persons from the name of Christian.

The following declaration is the fruit of a good many years' thought and discussion, and is here tentatively set out in the hope that it may arouse interest, serving the unity which is so vitally necessary, without infringing the right to differ on the many issues which arise out of the central faith. It is also a challenge to the representatives of the different churches to commit themselves to some clear assertion of *common* belief.

'There is one (and only one) living God, the Author and Sustainer of the universe, whose nature is Wisdom and Love. The Christian believes that God actively *manifests* his existence and nature in many ways ("at sundry times and in divers manners"), and that human beings may *apprehend* this existence and nature through friendship and community, through suffering and joy, through experience of beauty in nature and art, through thought in philosophy and science, through the prophets, and through every channel of religious life. But most important of all, he believes the nature and love of God to have been actively shown and actually embodied in the person, teaching, life and death of Jesus Christ, in whose being the nature and love of God were as completely revealed and realised as it is possible for them to be revealed and realised in a single human being. Not through his teaching alone (Christianity can never be reduced to a code of ethics) but through the quality of his life itself and in the manner of his death the Christian believes to be shown the very nature of God, of self-sacrificing love. Belief that this is so, "belief in Christ," is the central core of the Christian religion.

Man is highly self-centred, in the sense that his perspectives, his interests and his actions are determined, inevitably and naturally, by the circumstances in which he is placed. But man is also self-centred in another sense, tending constantly to assert his own will as against the will of God: this is "sin." The Christian asserts the true and the only true way of man's life to be found in reconciliation with God through humble confession of his sin and complete submission before Him. It is his faith that man's repentance is met by the divine forgiveness, that in *some* sense (far too profound to be told in a few phrases) the meaning of the divine forgiveness is supremely revealed and enacted in the Cross, and that the Holy Spirit is an active and continuing influence in the lives of men. The Christian holds, too, that only through the apprehension of the love of God and in freely given submission to his will can he properly understand the love of brother-man; the Brotherhood of Man is apprehended as an aspect of the Fatherhood of God. Christianity is thus humanistic but not merely humanistic. It believes that the sanctity and the equality of human beings are not *ultimately* human attributes but are derived from the purpose of God.

'In all these things the Christian finds constant inspiration through intelligent understanding of the religious wisdom of the Old and New Testaments. Finally, though varying temperaments and experiences demand very varying

opportunities for their expression and fulfilment, the Christian is bound to acknowledge that personal life is completed in the life of the Community of Christians, historically founded by Christ. The existing and the historical Church has certainly been marred by manifold sins and failures; but this is not to deny the vital necessity for a true Christian church in the life of society: the Christian strongly affirms this necessity.'

LOUIS ARNAUD REID.
W. R. NIBLETT.
M. V. C. JEFFREYS.

[We gladly publish this important letter signed by Louis Arnaud Reid (Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at King's College, Newcastle, in the University of Durham — a Presbyterian), William Roy Niblett (Lecturer in Education at King's College and Acting Registrar of the University of Durham — a Congregationalist), and Montague Vaughan Castleman Jeffreys (Professor of Education in the Durham Division of the University of Durham — a member of the Church of England).

As a modern declaration of Christian Faith, it is to be commended because it firmly restricts itself to affirming those centralities of the Christian Religion which are held by all Christians in common. There is, however, perhaps one exception — belief in the necessity for a Christian Church. As Modern Churchmen, we regard an organized Christian Church as a necessity for the permanent influence of the Christian Religion in human society; but we think that there are many mystical and individualist Christians who do not.

As Christian educationists we recognize that this Modern Declaration of Christian Faith can only be of service to adults. In the case of the young, we favour the use of affirmations of Christian Faith, Worship and Duty in the form of hymns, psalms and canticles. Good service can be rendered to the cause of Christian Education by judicious collections, carefully selected and arranged and set to the best music. These collections should be learnt by heart.—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

MANCHESTER READER'S DIVINITY COURSE

Since it has been impossible to arrange an annual Conference this summer, it occurs to me that the course which is to be held at Reed Hall, Exeter, August 2nd—9th, may prove a happy alternative for some of your readers. Devised for all comers, the lectures give 'a historical and literary background to the books of the Bible.' Reed Hall is magnificently situated 250 feet above the City of Exeter, and members of the course will find congenial companionship in delightful surroundings. I will gladly forward details on application.

R. G. GRIFFITH,
Hon. Secretary.

Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bletchley, Bucks.
February 18th, 1944.

SIR,

THE HISTORIC MISSION OF JESUS

I should like to be allowed to express my gratitude for Mr. Pilcher's very generous review of my book, *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, in your issue dated December last. I am glad to find that he is able to go so far in agreement with me. I should like to be allowed to comment on one or two special points:

(1) Mr. Pilcher's reference to 'the assumption that the Walk to Emmaus is not historical' might easily lead an unwary reader to suppose that I had explicitly made such an assumption. That, however, is not the case. What I urged was that the Resurrection appearances were neither mere hallucinations nor purely legendary, but were objective visions, *i.e.* 'real manifestations of himself given to the disciples by the risen Lord' (p. 281). I do not think this theory is inconsistent with my disbelief in the emptiness of the tomb, though it possibly may seem so to others.

(2) I am a little disappointed to learn that Mr. Pilcher thinks 'there is really nothing fresh in the book.' It is, of course, not easy to advance a suggestion about the Gospel story that *no one* has ever thought of before. But, as theories go, I should have thought that the fullness of my argument for Jesus' initial expectation of success, my consequent attempt to distinguish between his earlier and his later eschatology, and my discussion of the relation between his Judaism and his universalism, and of the *political* interest discernible in his teaching, might perhaps have a little claim to be recognized as comparatively new features.

(3) When I used Shakespeare's phrase, 'Misery acquaints a man with strange bed-fellows,' applying it to the unnatural alliance between Form-critics and Barthians, I was a little doubtful of the fitness of the quotation, in view of the word 'misery.' Mr. Pilcher's accidental alteration of it to 'mystery' makes the quotation still less apt.

C. J. CADOUX.

179 Woodstock Road, Oxford.

SIR,

M.C.U. COUNCIL ELECTIONS

It was resolved at the meeting of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union held in London on December 8th, 1943, in accordance with the terms of a minute of the annual meeting of 1942 authorizing the Council to determine periods of office during the war, that the annual elections should be resumed this year, that is to say, that those elected in 1939 should retire together with all co-opted members, and that a letter should be sent for insertion in the *Modern Churchman* to inform members of this decision and of its implications.

The Council normally consists of forty members, apart from Vice-Presidents, ten being elected each year to serve for three years and ten being co-opted for one year.

The following were elected in 1939: Miss A. M. Ashley, M.A.; Rev. G. W. Butterworth, M.A., Litt.D.; Rev. A. R. C. Leaney, C.F., M.A.; Rev. T. H. Maxfield, M.A.; Rev. J. K. Nettlefold, M.A.; Rev. F. I. L. Rees, M.A.; J. H. Simpson, M.A.; Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil.; two other members having resigned.

The co-opted members are: Rev. A. W. Adams, M.A.; Rev. H. Bailey, M.A., C.F.; Rev. Canon A. N. Bax, M.A.; Ven. Archdeacon of Ipswich; Rev. W. G. Fallows, M.A.; Miss W. M. Fayerman, M.A.; S. K. Jones, B.A.; Rev. Canon W. H. Mackean, D.D.; Rev. W. Richardson, M.A.; Rev. I. T. Ramsey, M.A.; Rev. H. J. Trueman, M.A. Another vacancy occurs by the death of Sir Francis Fremantle, O.B.E., M.D., M.P.

Ten vacancies must be filled by election of members to serve for three years and twelve by co-option by the Council for one year only. Members who have served for a period of three years are not eligible for election for another similar period but are eligible for co-option. Those who have served for a year by co-option are eligible for nomination for election for three years or may be co-opted again.

Any member may nominate one or more (up to four) candidates for election. Names of candidates with those of proposer and seconder should reach me by April 15th.

R. GLADSTONE GRIFFITH, *Hon. Sec.*

Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bletchley, Bucks.
February 11th, 1944.

TWO CORRECTIONS

In September, 1943, *M.C.*, p. 178, line 18, for *Sir Edward Lutyens* read *Sir Herbert Baker.*

In December, 1943, *M.C.*, p. 270, line 7, for *Rev. Leslie Weatherhead,* read *Rev. A. T. Wethered.*

ED., *M.C.*